DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 224 295 FL 013 330

TITLE New Priorities for the Teaching and Learning of East Asian Languages. Conference Report (Washington, D.C., October 2, 1981).
INSTITUTION Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Washington, D. C.
PUB DATE 2 Oct 81
NOTE 107p.; Prepared by the East Asian Program.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Chinese; Educational Innovation; Government Role; *Japanese; *Korean; Language Proficiency; Language Teachers; Language Tests; *Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning; Teacher Education; Testing; *Uncommonly Taught Languages

ABSTRACT

The status and priorities of the teaching of East Asian languages were discussed in eight papers presented at a 1981 conference. The topics addressed include: (1) the need to give language teaching a higher priority as a national concern; (2) the role of the federal government in East Asian language study; (3) the teaching of Japanese, Korean, and Chinese in the United States; (4) language teacher training; (5) the role of innovations in foreign language teaching; and (6) language proficiency testing. The importance of training qualified language instructors, the need to place teachers with specialized training in language classrooms, and the importance of matching federal support for language study with a major commitment to quality instruction by the schools are among the points emphasized. (RW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED224295

EAST AS

THE W ENTER

CONFER NCE REPORT

NEW PRIORIT EACHIN AND LEARNING O LANGU

BER 2, 198

FL013330

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ronald A. Morse
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

NEW PRIORITIES FOR THE TEACHING AND LEARNING OF EAST ASIAN LANGUAGES

East Asia Program

The Wilson Center
Smithsonian Institution Building
Washington, D.C. 20560
(202) 357-1937

The Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars subscribes to a policy of equal educational and employment opportunities.

Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars

Smithsonian Institution Building
1000 Jefferson Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20560
(202) 357-1937

THE WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS

The Wilson Center, located in the Smithsonian Institution's historic castle building on the Mall in Washington, D.C., is the official memorial to the 28th President of the United States. Chartered by Congress in 1968, and dedicated by the President in February 1971, the Center offers residential fellowships in the humanities and social sciences to scholars and professionals from around the world. It also promotes communication between the world of learning and the world of public affairs through an ongoing series of meetings, seminars, and publications which regularly attract a broad cross-section of the Washington community for provocative and timely discussions. The Center is funded by annual Congressional appropriation and also by contributions from the private sector.

The Wilson Center is a unique institution in Washington; it is both an ivory tower for working scholars and an intellectual crossroads, where legislators, policy makers, journalists, business and labor executives meet to reflect on and discuss important issues in an impartial way. Without a tenured faculty or extended appointments, the Center, through its six programs, offers an open environment where an international community of scholars can work together, transcending disciplines and nationalities, toward tentative answers to the important questions facing the nation and the world.

THE EAST ASIA PROGRAM

In June 1980, the Board of Trustees of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars approved the formal establishment of the East Asia Program for a three-year term of full operation. In February 1981, the first permanent secretary of the East Asia Program, Ronald A. Morse, assumed his duties at the Center. The formal establishment of the East Asia Program reflects the fact that East Asian studies have a vital role to play at the Center and the judgment that the Wilson Center can make a major contribution to the study of Asia in the United States.

This conference was made possible with support from Marubeni American Corporation; Mitsui and Company (U.S.A.), Inc.; Nichimen Company, Inc.; Nissho Iwai America Corporation; and Toshoku America, Inc.

CONTENTS

Preface
Ronald A. Morse
Secretary, East Asia Program
The Wilson Center

Contributors

I National Priorities

Language Teaching As a National Concern 1
Paul Simon, U.S. Representative from Illinois

The Role of the Federal Government in East Asian Language Study 7
Richard T. Thompson, Department of Education

II The State of the Field

Japanese Language Teaching: Whence, Where and Whither 12
Eleanor H. Jorden, Cornell University

Teaching Korean in America Today 26
S. Robert Ramsey, Columbia University

Chinese Language Teaching in the United States: Demand, Needs, and Responses 35
James J. Wrenn, Brown University

III New Priorities

Foreign Language Teaching Training: Whose Move? 46
James S. Noblitt, Cornell University

Conflicting Paradigms in Foreign Language Education: Rethinking Innovation 54
A. Ronald Walton, University of Pennsylvania

Testing and Evaluation 79
John L.D. Clark, Center for Applied Linguistics

PREFACE

Recognizing that the time had come for colleges and universities across the nation to seriously reexamine how and why they teach East Asian languages, The Wilson Center's East Asia Program organized a conference on the subject in October 1981. The importance of the subject and the quality of the presentations warranted, in my view, sharing the findings with a much larger audience. While this conference volume is focused on the Chinese, Japanese and Korean languages, the meeting had a much broader focus -- the importance of foreign or second language acquisition to a healthy development of our nation. For language learning to be effective, our public and private institutions of learning must now prepare to train a whole new breed of qualified language instructors. The participants at the conference made an important point: federal support for foreign language study has been important, but now it must be matched by a major commitment in our schools, where teaching is done, to improve language education. This can be accomplished by training and employing substantively skilled language practitioners -- a whole new species of language instructor called "pedalinguists".

We now know a great deal about effective teacher training; we are just beginning to use this knowledge. But it must be applied even faster. Language pedagogy can no longer be regarded as an activity for amateurs, requiring nothing more than competence in the target language with or without specialized training in teaching technique. A degree in a related discipline is not enough: the Ph.D. in literature is no more qualified to teach a foreign language, or write language teaching materials, or evaluate language performance, than a pedalinguist is qualified to teach medieval literature or modern poetry.

We also know a great deal about second language acquisition, and if we utilize this knowledge, we can certainly improve our results in the classroom. But no noticeable progress is possible unless we insist that the task be handled by specialists. The essays in this volume are intended to stimulate a reconsideration of our Asian language teaching methods and priorities by placing the debate within a broader context of expertise. Examining Chinese, Japanese and Korean together in the same context also enables the authors to highlight both their common and unique language problems -- issues that are often assumed or overlooked in our Asian studies centers.

There is evidence of a groundswell of interest in foreign languages since the publication of the foreign language and international studies report, Strength Through Wisdom. East Asian languages, in particular, are enjoying a striking increase in student interest. If this new enthusiasm is to be encouraged, we must broaden the language curriculum to satisfy the increasingly diversified interests of the students, and we must guarantee that adequately trained teachers be in their classrooms.

Continued federal support for language programs is only a part of the problem. There can be no substitute for the dedication of school administrators and language program directors in guaranteeing high quality language instruction in their classrooms. This was the message of the conference, and the papers in this volume represent a first and important step in dealing with the issues.

Ronald A. Morse
Secretary, East Asia Program

CONTRIBUTORS

John L.D. Clark is Director of Foreign Language Education at the Center for Applied Linguistics. Until July 1981 he was a Senior Examiner and Director of several projects on testing and foreign languages at the Educational Testing Service. He has an M.A. in romance languages from the University of North Carolina and a doctorate in foreign language research from Harvard University. Dr. Clark has published extensively, most recently as the author of Foreign Language Testing: Theory and Practice.

Eleanor H. Jorden is Mary Donlon Alger Professor of Linguistics and Director of the Japanese language full-year Asian language concentration program (FALCON) at Cornell University. She was President of the Association for Asian Studies (1980-81) and is currently President of the Association of Teachers of Japanese. She is author of the text Beginning Japanese, now in its 23rd printing.

James S. Noblitt joined the Department of Modern Languages of Cornell University in 1967. He has a doctorate in French Linguistics from Harvard University and was a researcher at the Center for Applied Linguistics before joining Cornell. Dr. Noblitt teaches general and applied linguistics and is the author of an introductory French text entitled Nouveau Point de Vue. For five years he has been director of Cornell's summer training program for graduate assistants in modern foreign languages.

S. Robert Ramsey is Assistant Professor of East Asian Languages and Cultures at Columbia University, where he teaches languages and linguistics. He is the author of a book and a number of articles on Korean and Japanese and is presently writing a book on the languages of East Asia for the non-specialist.

Paul Simon has been a major force in the federal effort to revive our flagging interest in foreign language learning. His book, The Tongue-Tied American (1980), discusses the cultural, economic, and strategic consequences of the inability of Americans to speak foreign languages. Congressman Simon serves on the Education and Labor Committee of the House of Representatives, where he chairs the Subcommittee on Postsec-

ondary Education. A journalist and veteran of the Illinois State government, Paul Simon has represented the 24th District of Illinois since 1974.

Richard T. Thompson is currently Acting Director of International Education Programs at the U.S. Department of Education. He has a degree in oriental studies from the University of Pennsylvania and a doctorate in linguistics from Georgetown University. His teaching and publishing has been in the field of Chinese language studies.

Aubrey Ronald Walton is Assistant Professor of Chinese language and linguistics and Director of the Chinese Language Program at the University of Pennsylvania. He was coordinator of the intensive Chinese language program (FALCON) at Cornell University for three years and is immediate past president of the National Association of Self-Instructional Language Programs. His research interests are in theoretical phonology and Chinese dialectology, especially the tonal systems of the Southern Wu dialects.

James J. Wrenn is Professor of Linguistics at Brown University and a recognized expert on Chinese language materials. He directs the Brown University team-teaching program in elementary Chinese and, among his many projects, has contributed to the preparation of the forthcoming textbook series, Standard Chinese: A Modular Approach.

I

Paul Simon

Richard T. Thompson

LANGUAGE TEACHING AS A NATIONAL CONCERN

Paul Simon

I am pleased to be here for a number of reasons, perhaps mostly because this is a topic of great personal interest to me.

In the brief time available let me share with you some examples of cultural, economic and security issues that demonstrate our need for giving a higher national priority to language teaching and learning. At the national level we have done a great deal but could do more. But to make our system of language acquisition work better we need cooperation at all levels of our society. That is why we are here together today. I will confine my remarks to the more general points, since I know that Dr. Thompson will go into greater detail regarding federal programs.

When I talk about language, I am really speaking of language in a broader context. I am concerned about our insensitivity to other cultures generally. It so happens that we can gauge that insensitivity most precisely in the area of language, and so that is the focus of my remarks. We are the only nation on the face of the earth where you can go through grade school, high school, and college, get a Ph.D. and never have a year of a foreign language. Believe it or not, you can get a Ph.D. in international studies without having a year of foreign language, which I find incomprehensible. Fewer than one percent of our grade schools offer foreign languages; one fifth of our high schools do not offer foreign languages; and one fifth of our community colleges do not offer foreign languages. We have state universities that do not offer foreign languages including, I regret to say, one in the state of Illinois. There has been a general decline in language studies over the years, though I think for a variety of reasons this may be leveling off. What harm has all of this done to the nation? Let us consider three areas of concern.

Cultural Insensitivity

The cultural area is one. I spoke at the University of North Carolina some months ago and a professor from Georgia was there. She came up to me and told me about a discussion with a school board member who said to her, "Why should a student who will never leave Macon, Georgia study a foreign language?" She replied, "That's why he should study a foreign language." By ignoring language we deprive ourselves culturally. Our cultural isolation today is, unfortunately, a part of our environment. I am part of it, you are part of it. You as teachers are probably much less a part of it than I am. When the revolution erupted in Iran, I suddenly found myself reading about different groups of Islamic religious sects. While I

know something about Christianity and Judaism, I knew almost nothing about the Muslim world, despite my travels to that part of the of the globe.

Public television aired a series on the history of civilizations a few years ago. It was all about Western Europe and North America. With all due respect, civilization is more than Western Europe and North America. One of my favorite quotes -- in fact I put it in my last book it is such a good quotation -- comes from an editorial in a newspaper in California. It said "Pointing to a little known part of the Helsinki Accords in 1975 which obligates the signing nations to encourage the study of foreign languages within its boarders, Representative Paul Simon of Illinois is proposing to bribe colleges and universities with tax dollars to expand their foreign language departments. America has come further in the realm of individual living standards in two hundred years than other nations advanced in two thousand. We have conquered the problems of travel, disease, construction, have subdued the earth's skies and seas and caused them to serve humanity. And we did it all without the aid of the metric system or expensive foreign language education which has swayed some politician's inferiority complex". It kind of reminds me of H. L. Mencken's old saying, "If English was good enough for Jesus Christ, it is good enough for me".

Economic Costs

We are depriving ourselves culturally, and we are also depriving ourselves economically in a variety of ways. Michelin, the radial tire manufacturer in France, published an article in a French technical journal about why certain processes don't work in the manufacture of radial tires. Unfortunately, no one at the Firestone Corporation read the French article and Firestone lost tens of millions of dollars. Eighty percent of the American businesses that should be exporting are not. The reason is very simple: if you want to sell, you have to speak the language of your customers. You can buy in any language, but you can't sell in any language. Our friends in Japan and Germany, as well as Denmark and Sweden and the other countries that export much more than we do in terms of their percent of the GNP, have learned that lesson. We have yet to learn this important lesson.

I could give you many more illustrations. A U.S. Senator pointed out that New York City contains approximately ten thousand Japanese salesmen, all of whom speak English. In all of Japan there are approximately nine hundred American salesmen,

most of whom do not speak Japanese. He asked the question, "Who do you think sells more?" The answer is fairly obvious.

We make mistakes because of the lack of language skills, mistakes that cost us in jobs. General Motors puts out a car that is called a Nova. Nova in Spanish means "doesn't go." Not surprisingly, it didn't sell in Latin America. They changed the name to Cureba and it sold. While this is a minor matter, a minor insensitivity, the gaffe cost jobs and hurt our balance of trade. "Body by Fisher" came out in Flemish as "corpse by Fisher." Parker Pen was advertised in Latin American newspapers as having certain contraceptive benefits. And one that some of you will appreciate: "come alive with Pepsi" came out in the first edition of the Chinese Readers Digest as "Pepsi brings your ancestors back from the grave."

A decreasing percentage of the technical papers produced on the face of the earth are being published in English. If we want to find out what's going on in the world of automobile tires, or medicine, or how the Finns break through the ice with ships, we have to read foreign journals printed in other languages.

Language Skills and National Security

The third area of language impact is in the realm of national security. Let me give you one illustration of why this area is so important. There is almost literally no survival in a nuclear war. Just about a year ago in Arkansas, a Titan II Missile accident occurred. An Air Force sergeant was walking along, dropped a wrench, broke a little aluminum tube, and a Titan II missile took off and landed in a wooded area. The warhead did not detonate. The newspapers, radio and television reported that it was a nine megaton warhead. That meant nothing to me and I suppose it meant nothing to most people that heard it.

I asked the Congressional Research Service what a megaton meant. Quite clearly we speak in foreign languages even in some of the technical terminology we use. What is a megaton? For one thing, all the bombs used in World War II including Nagasaki and Hiroshima totalled about 2 megatons. Another illustration: if you read about a terrorist blowing up an automobile, chances are that one to three pounds of TNT were involved. A megaton is the equivalent of a 300 mile long railroad freight train loaded with TNT. Nine megatons is the equivalent of a railroad freight train 2,700 miles long, almost from where we are here out to Los Angeles. This is power

that we can't really conceive, and there are warheads substantially larger than nine megatons. The U.S. has somewhere around 9,200 warheads. The Soviets have somewhere around 6,500 warheads. That is the world we live in. It is a world where we have to communicate if we don't want to self-destruct. So communication is not simply a luxury; it's a vital part of our existence.

In the last three years, fifty-two American colleges and universities have dropped the teaching of Russian. There are more teachers of English in the Soviet Union then there are students of Russian in the United States. Further, the Soviet Union, as I am sure many of you know, includes regions where Asian languages are dominant. Russian today is a minority mother tongue in the Soviet Union. We also pay almost no attention to these other languages.

I was a delegate to the United Nations Special Session on Disarmament in 1978. The second day of the meeting Foreign Minister Gromyko invited the U.S. delegation to meet with the Soviet delegates and the co-chairs of the U.S. delegation Secretary of State Cyrus Vance and Ambassador W. Avbral Harriman. We worked through an interpreter. Actually, it's not quite correct to say we worked through an interpreter, because I know that Gromyko speaks and understands English. I also think I am correct in saying that every Soviet delegate there knew, understood and spoke English. Not one member of the U.S. delegation spoke or understood Russian. They had a tremendous advantage. I'd love to get into a debate on the floor of the House today, where I have that kind of advantage over my opponent.

One more illustration: I had the chance to get reasonably well acquainted with two Soviet officials. We have had lunch and dinners together. We disagree on some things rather strongly, as you might imagine. As a result of our communications, however, I understand their form of government a little better. I think they understand our form of government a little better and this is important.

The Deputy Director of the CIA, Admiral Robert Inman, recently testified before a House Subcommittee I chair that the failure of students in our schools to learn other languages represents a major long-range security hazard for the United States. I have introduced a bill in Congress that is pending before our Subcommittee. I hope that it will emerge in another week from the Subcommittee. It would assist and support foreign language studies in the U.S. A few days ago Secretary of Defense Weinberger indicated to me that he is trying to push this legislation along inside the administration. I hope also

that we can get the Department of Education pushing in this direction. The need is obvious for many reasons. When Richard Nixon visited China, the Chinese provided the interpreter. When Deng Hsiao Ping visited the United States, the Chinese provided the interpreter. We cannot just go on and on in this way.

Vietnam is perhaps the classic illustration of the security-language situation. As far as I have been able to determine, there were fewer than five American-born specialists in the State Department or the Defense Department who spoke the language of that area and understood the culture when the U.S. first became involved there in Indochina. What if we had had ten or twenty or fifty specialists? That war cost 56 thousand American lives, three million Asian lives, one-hundred and thirty-five billion dollars and left perhaps permanent scars on our society. To be sure, we can't rerun history, but we can learn lessons from history.

Legislative Remedies

Finally, we must ask what can be done to correct this situation? The bill I have pending would provide a financial incentive to move in this direction. It contains special incentives for the less commonly taught languages, which would obviously include many Asian languages.

Other signs of progress exist as well. Last year I introduced an amendment to the Foreign Service Act. The United States is the only major country on the face of the earth where you can get into the Foreign Service without having the knowledge of a foreign language.

The scarcity of language proficient posts at our embassies often puts the U.S. at a serious disadvantage in dealing with the host country. Iran is an obvious example. Of the fifty-two hostages, six spoke Farsi, the language of the people. Only two spoke it fluently. We had not a single person from the CIA stationed in Iran who spoke Farsi. It should not startle us that we did not handle ourselves too well in that situation. My amendment to the Foreign Service Act states that as of October 1 of this year the Secretary of State has to designate embassies in two non-English speaking countries by January 1, 1983 in which everyone in the Embassy, including the Marine guards and the support staff, must speak the language of the country. I have been notified by The Secretary that the two embassies will be those in Kakar, Senegal and Montevideo Uruguay.

I was able to get an amendment to the Military Authorization Bill adopted which asks the armed services to examine foreign language programs at military academies. We also proposed that ROTC have a foreign language component. The provision of a pay incentive for American personnel stationed overseas to study the languages of the countries in which they are stationed was also raised. We have special problems in Korea and Japan in this regard. Of 488,000 American service personnel stationed abroad, 412 are recognized by the services as being linguistically competent. This not a record I think we should be proud of.

There are a great many other things that need to be done. Let me close by saying there is no area where what we do is, in my opinion, more important than learning to communicate with others. Inevitably, that has to mean much more communication in the countries of Asia. Indonesia, for example, is a neglected country. It is the world's fifth largest country in terms of population. We have hardly any students of Burmese in the United States. Probably only one or two experts are available.

Clearly if we want to build a world of peace and hope and stability for the generations to come, we have to communicate with others in their own languages.

THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN EAST ASIAN LANGUAGE STUDY

Richard T. Thompson

Congressman Paul Simon, and many others, have worked hard to gain federal government support for the vital task of improving language learning in our society. Over the years our legislators, federal agencies and national language associations have cooperated effectively to supply leadership and resources to promote language and area studies nationwide.

Today, I would like to elaborate on what has already been said and review with you some of the history behind the federal support for foreign language study. As we begin, it is important to keep in mind that "learning" and "teaching" must be examined separately when we try to suggest new goals and priorities for the study of East Asian languages. We must also remember that the government can only do so much. If our ideas and suggestions are to be put into practice in our institutions of higher learning, you, the teachers and program directors at our resources centers, must seek to implement them. I am sure all of you will return to the classroom aware that you could be doing more to improve the quality of instruction. A great deal of effort, however, will be needed to correct the educational deficiencies in our present programs.

The Spur of War

Many factors have contributed to our present educational problems and many studies have examined the issues. Public education during our first century was designed to prepare a small number of people to enter college. A reading knowledge of a foreign language was considered to be the hallmark of an educated man, and the educational system emphasized the study of Latin, Greek, French and, intermittently, German.

In the 1920's, the Carnegie Corporation financed a study of foreign languages. The report concluded that reading was the only attainable objective in public secondary schools. This view was not seriously questioned until World War II. Wartime linguists found themselves working with largely unwritten languages for which no teaching materials existed and under short deadlines to produce language specialists for communication and intelligence purposes. These dilemmas and the responses to them had a profound impact on current foreign language education practices. One effect was the development of the linguistic informant method, featuring a concentratior on speaking and understanding a foreign language. The wartime difficulties also helped to shape the National Defense Education Act, Title VI, which remains the foundation of the U.S. Department of Education's international support program.

In 1952, the Modern Language Association inaugurated an important Foreign Language Program under the direction of its Executive Secretary, William Riley Parker, with the aid of a Rockefeller Foundation grant. The Foreign Language Program sought to encourage the study of foreign languages at all levels of American education. The early stages of the program were characterized by fact finding and data collection to ascertain the state of the art, as well as by attempts to unify a profession seriously divided over goals and methods of language teaching.

Sputnik's Impact

In 1956, the foreign language program adopted a nine-point document on language policy. This document's recommendations included many of the major practices already adopted by the ACLS and the ASTP: initial emphasis on listening and speaking, followed by reading and writing, intensive oral drill, small classes and the allotment of more hours to foreign language study. One year later, in 1957, the year of Sputnik, the Modern Language Association initiated a five-year plan designed to encourage more Americans to study foreign languages, to improve and modernize foreign language instruction at all levels, to encourage the study of uncommonly taught languages with new programs and new tests and teaching materials, and, finally, to establish pilot programs in selected states to serve as delivery systems for the new methodology.

Although the five-year plan failed to receive the requested Ford Foundation support, the Center for Applied Linguistics was born, and most of the planning and thinking which produced it laid the ground-work for an important part of what was to become the National Defense Education Act just one year later.

The NDEA Language Development Programs constituted the largest and most determined attack on modern foreign language research and training in history. They dwarfed earlier programs in scope and intensity. They owed their existence to the efforts of all the linguists, foreign language teachers, and education specialists who contributed to the major foreign language programs mentioned above, as well as to the thousands of teachers and faculty members in the schools, colleges, and universities throughout the country who supported and participated in the various programs under NDEA Title VI. The fabric of NDEA was woven primarily from the separate threads of programs and interests that had represented both the commonly and uncommonly taught languages in the pre- and post-World War II periods.

Specifically, the new methodologies that grew out of the World War II experience with ACLS and ASTP were endorsed and debated through the Foreign Language Program of the Modern Language Association and were implemented through NDEA VI in three important ways: first, through NDEA teacher training institutes; second, through the establishment of NDEA foreign language and area studies centers; and third, through the development of foreign language curricula and teaching materials, which introduced to the classroom the new methodologies found in such still-popular texts as the Audio-Lingual Method (A-LM) series.

Maintaining the Momentum

At the beginning of the last decade, the Modern Language Association, in recognition of the field's plight, sought to rekindle interest and commitment through a newly designed foreign language program for the seventies. A full assessment was concluded and excellent recommendations were made. Unfortunately, the necessary monitoring, implementation and follow-up provisions failed to receive the required attention and funding. In 1973, the American Council on Education (ACE), with support from the Ford Foundation, launched the International Education Project (IEP). A Task Force on Language was established. Its subsequent work and recommendations, including the recommendation to establish a Presidential Commission, built upon earlier efforts and carried the field forward. The Modern Language Association, in cooperation with the American Council of Learned Societies and with support from the Rockefeller Foundation and the National Endowment for the Humanities, launched a Language Task Force project in 1977. Reports from the task forces on the commonly taught languages, the uncommonly taught languages, and institutional language policy alone contained some 97 different policy and educational recommendations. More importantly, these reports identified and described the major issues facing language educators. Totalling several hundred pages in their unabridged form, these studies constitute the best statement of current status in the history of the profession.

Recommendations, Not Real Progress

The Report of the President's Commission contains an additional 65 recommendations. Other recent studies increase the number of recommendations to over 200. Unfortunately, little real progress has been made. As the "Perkins Commission" report, Strength Through Wisdom (A Report to the President from the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International

Studies), states: "...the hard and brutal fact is that our programs and institutions for education and training for foreign language and international understanding are both currently inadequate and actually falling behind. This growing deficiency must be corrected if we are to secure our national objectives as we enter the twenty-first century."

The findings of the Perkins Commission influenced the late 1979 formulation of the revised version of Title VI of the National Defense Education Act. The Education Amendments of 1980 included the following changes:

-- Title VI became part of the Higher Education Act;

-- a three-level system of defining resource centers was introduced;

-- a new matching grant program for business and international education was introduced; and

-- restrictions limiting fellowships were lifted.

The Outlook, in Brief

In 1981 the U.S. Congress provided an overall 40 percent increase in appropriations for international programs. Fulbright programs increased by over 100 percent. Existing programs were strengthened. In the competition for national resource centers in 1981-1982 the Department of Education identified priority uses for increased funding: strengthening the quality of language programs through teacher training and the improvement of testing and language measurement capabilities. These grants went into effect in September, and many of of you at this conference owe your presence here to this new sense of priorities. "Goals of training," "standards of performance," and "linguistic competence" are the new phrases that will be assuming increasing importance in your respective fields of language training.

Other issues will need examination in the months ahead. Textbooks have all too often dominated the curriculum and generated false hopes. Texts are often developed on the basis of sound linguistic principles -- a hierarchy of grammatical complexity and a vocabulary chosen to illustrate the needs of a more or less artificial situation necessary to practice certain syntactic forms. The textbook, if followed faithfully and used with bright and dedicated students for two years, is supposed to somehow produce a language competent scholar ready for fieldwork. The aspiring economist, the theory goes, could

read and analyze the data needed, and the budding historian or literature specialist could read medieval texts with remarkable speed. The text has been left to define the objectives and the process.

Unfortunately, such progress never comes so easily and much in the classroom is the result of chance. The materials are often quite unrelated to the tasks of the scholars. Language teachers are not always knowledgeable about student needs. Without a set of objectives one cannot chart an effective course in language learning terms.

The goals for foreign language education have not been thoroughly examined in our educational institutions. Overcoming this problem for Chinese, Japanese and Korean is the task we have set for ourselves at this conference today. What we must now aim for is an integration of the goals of instructions, the curriculum, the testing process and the teacher's language teaching skills. The Wilson Center has supplied us with an important opportunity to begin the examination of these issues through this conference. The message of our discussions must now be carried to directors of our nation's language programs.

II

James J. Wrenn

S. Robert Ramsey

Eleanor H. Jorden

JAPANESE LANGUAGE TEACHING: WHENCE, WHERE AND WHITHER

Eleanor H. Jorden

A few years ago, I worked in a department which included language training for all of Asia. One day, a new secretary joined the department, and I happened to call out her name, to ask her to come into my office. A moment later, a member of the South East Asian staff came in to ask about what he had just heard me say. When I explained that I had simply called out our new secretary's name, he looked concerned. It turned out that the young woman's name was, in his language, one of the more colorful taboo words never uttered in public and especially not by a woman. After some discussion about how we would handle this awkward situation, he prepared to leave, but at the doorway he turned and said softly, "Would you call her again?" This story never fails to remind me of the crucial difference between the insiders' and the outsiders' view of any given language -- and both have their place and their use.

Why did we call this conference? I submit that a society which currently places so much emphasis on encounter groups, self-awareness, consciousness-raising, and assertiveness training should give equally serious attention to foreign language study. Perhaps some meditation on where we are, and an assertive stand on what the future direction of the field should be, would help bring us closer to the current mainstream of American society.

We are here neither for self-flagellation nor for self-adulation. We will not suggest that all is disaster out there in the East Asian language classroom nor certainly that all is well. We want to consider the field as objectively as possible, with the goal, obviously, of effecting improvement. This requires a candid airing of the difficulties in order to generate frank discussion that may lead to the beginnings of progress and reform. Just identifying and increasing awareness of the problems will represent a major step forward.

An undeniable urgency surrounds the task. As a result of the activities of the Perkins Commission last year, some increase in interest in foreign language study was generated. Congressman Simon's efforts in behalf of the cause -- his work in and out of Congress and the publishing of his recent book on the subject -- represent support of a kind rarely encountered by our field, and the international political and economic environment dramatically highlights our need for further training in East Asian languages. Enrollments in Japanese and Chinese have actually been steadily increasing, while the study of many other foreign languages, particularly German and Russian, has been declining sharply during recent years. In a random sampling of a few institutions this past week, I have found a significant increase in Japanese enrollments everywhere. At Cornell, there has been a 40% jump over the last

year, bringing Japanese for the first time nearly to the level of one of the "bulk languages." If we are to take advantage of the current momentum and, most importantly, avoid the mistakes of the past, we must devote the most serious and immediate attention to the entire question.

Our nation's educational institutions contain a student population that can become interested in foreign language learning and convinced of its importance. Never before have so many students traveled abroad and experienced at first hand the frustrations of the monolingual. But the stereotype of the typical academic language class, with its lists of irregular verb forms and "prepositions that require the dative" leading to the decoding of literary passages into English through the tedious, motivation-killing use of bilingual dictionaries, alienates many prospective students before they begin. The assumption that the language classroom and the real world have little in common is depressingly widespread. If the East Asian language classroom supports the stereotype, it will not be long before currently increasing interest declines and enrollment figures follow the "German curve."

Self-Defeating Techniques

American students are taught distressingly little during their academic careers about the nature of language in general and about foreign language acquisition in particular. What does it really mean to study a language? Is any time devoted to the relevant orientation of foreign language students as to the precise goals of the training they are to be offered? Is the methodology itself ever explained or justified? Perhaps even more fundamental is the question of whether the teachers themselves have ever received such orientation. It is discouraging to note how inexorably the myths of language learning are perpetuated from generation to generation of students: we still hear that "the fastest way to learn a foreign language is just to go to the country where it is spoken"; that "if you can't do that, just find a native speaker of the target language"; that "reading a foreign language is really the only appropriate activity for the classroom, and it necessarily involves translating into one's native language"; that "the only really meaningful material for serious classroom study is literature"; and so on. Even so basic a problem as the fact/act dichotomy of language study -- i.e., the distinction between learning about the language as opposed to actually using the language -- is constantly ignored, along with recognition of the relative difficulty of the two branches for instructor and student alike. How often are students told apologetically that they

must pursue the boring study of basic language only as preparation for the "real stuff of language," i.e., the literature? Does this encourage the budding Japanese economist to remain in the course? And why isn't the prospective literature student encouraged to view the basic language as, in fact, the fabric of the literature to follow? The time has come for instructors in the field to examine their assumptions, their goals, and their procedures. Too many are floundering in a sea of prejudice which has gone unchecked and unquestioned.

Language is the stuff of communication, involving much more than the memorization of vocabulary and grammar rules. One does not arive at Japanese by translating English. Any student who is even for a moment encouraged, or even permitted, to think along those lines is being done a great disservice. Reading ability in Japanese cannot be measured simply by counting Chinese characters; nor can learning the Japanese language be equated with exposure to the written language alone: this is an assumption characteristic of the native paradigm, in which academic instruction regularly focuses on the acquisition of written skills.

Our topic today, involving the teaching of East Asian languages, might be approached from a number of different aspects, but we have chosen three basic areas that are all-pervasive: teacher training, improved evaluation techniques, and innovation. Two of these, teacher training and evaluation, coincide with areas singled out by the Department of Education this year as requiring increased attention.

The Teacher Training Gap

The first statement that must be made regarding teacher training in Japanese is that virtually none exists. In program after program, we find examples of the two most common varieties of language instructors: native speakers of the target language (often English literature majors during their undergraduate study at home, with no relevant training or background) and what I call the "also teach language" variety -- instructors with significant professional training ONLY in other disciplines, particularly the target literature or theoretical linguistics. (I am of course not including the literature specialist or theoretical linguist who is also a trained pedagogue.) The assumption which continues to pervade our society is that anyone who knows a language, particularly an East Asian language, is qualified to teach it without any specialized training or guidance. In how many universities are elementary Japanese language courses turned over to new

assistant professors or graduate teaching assistants, whose lack of expertise and experience is unfortunately matched only by their lack of professional interest! And why should budding scholars who are devoting their lives to the study of Heian literature be interested in teaching prospective international lawyers how to form negatives? Language classes must not be taught simply as a means of support or as a necessary evil by specialists whose enthusiasm lies elsewhere. "In your first job you have to expect to do the dirty work," was one graduate student's unfortunate but telling way of describing the situation.

Attitudes acquired during elementary instruction are crucial in setting the tone for the future. Students who have been well taught and motivated and stimulated by the Japanese instruction they received at the outset enjoy a permanent advantage. A growing body of evidence indicates that the quality of our initial educational experience in any area has a tremendous long-range effect on future success. Imagine the possible results if more of our beginning students were introduced to the language by experienced and enthusiastic pedagogical specialists, a professional group I call "pedalinguists."

I emphasize "experienced pedagogical specialists" because experience alone is not enough. Unfortunately, some experienced instructors are experienced primarily in questionable techniques. It is crucial to distinguish between five year's experience and one year's experience repeated five times. In fact, experience without substantive knowledge may produce a more self-assured and convincing transfer of misinformation.

High Attrition Is Unacceptable

One hears frequently about the very high attrition rate in Japanese language classes. Inevitably, the field will continue to attract some students who plan, from the outset, to study for only one year. And a gradual decrease in enrollments as one progresses to advanced classes is not surprising. However, when students drop Japanese courses within an academic year, the problem requires a thorough investigation. For example, a first-year class whose enrollment is reduced by upwards of 35% before its conclusion clearly reveals problems that should not be casually explained away as a function of the language's difficulty.

It goes without saying that an essential requirement for a skilled pedagogue is empathy. Obviously the rapport that is established between instructor and student has a critical effect on the learning process. Other personality factors of

the instructor -- liveliness, imagination, humor, and the like -- also exert an important influence. However, personality alone is not the basis of good language teaching. This should be so obvious as to require no mention, but there is still a surprising number of people who believe that cheerful, highly motivated, enthusiastic speakers of a language, by their very nature, have all the tools needed to be good teachers of that language.

The requirements of a good language pedagogue are in fact too extensive to discuss in detail at this point. Suffice it to say that the training is broad and rigorous, and that truly skilled practitioners are disappointingly rare. The average language student is perfectly content with mediocre teachers simply because he/she doesn't know any better. We laugh at the exchange, "How's your wife?" . . . "Compared to what?" but this is the problem faced by most of our students. They are content until they have a basis for comparison; then they become extremely critical.

The truly superior practitioner of the art of language teaching knows how to make the fact component of a course of study substantively accurate and how to handle the particularly difficult act component. As is true in so many skills areas, the more competent the practitioner, the more effortless the execution appears. Only observation of the unskilled and untrained can show by comparison how demanding the work really is and how few meet the highest standards.

But where can a prospective Japanese language instructor receive substantive training in foreign language pedagogy? Unfortunately, such a course of study is generally not available, hence the Department of Education's plea for more attention to the subject. Programs are beginning to be offered in Japan, but it is important to remember that Japanese as a foreign language is a comparatively new field of study in that country, only rarely found in regular academic institutions until recently. The approach usually adheres exclusively to the native paradigm. Least developed in these programs are any analyses of the methodology itself, a concern for the culture-specific mindsets of foreign students, and comprehensive linguistic analyses of the language.

The Complexities of Language Instruction

In the workshops for Japanese teachers offered at Cornell during the past three summers, the diverse participating trainees consistently expressed their amazement at how complex and demanding

and challenging foreign language instruction really is. And surfacing again and again have been the differences between the native and non-native paradigms. In other words, the ways in which instructors teach a language are also reflections of the society in which they were raised and socialized; similarly, culture-bound student attitudes and expectations rarely coincide with those of the target culture.

The study of a foreign language rarely indicates a desire on the part of students to relinquish membership in their own native society. The goal rather is an ability to communicate substantively and sensitively with members of the foreign culture in their own language. Advanced proficiency will permit more precise and more sensitive communication, but at no point will the foreigners experience the same emotional involvement native speakers feel in using their own language.

To take one simple example from English, the differences in the sociolinguistic implications of mom, mommy, mama, and mother can be explained to a Japanese, but he/she can hardly be expected to share the emotional reactions of a native speaker upon hearing an inappropriate or atypical utterance of one of these alternate forms. And I remind you of my opening story and the contrast in reactions it represented.

Team-Teaching

My own conviction is that the ideal instructional paradigm is team-teaching -- natives of the target language and culture working cooperatively with natives of the students' native language and culture. It is such a team that can best satisfy the requirements of the students. Their need for natives of the target language and culture is self-evident: these instructors, the authentic, emotionally-involved language users, serve as the models for everything the students study. But also needed to fill complementary roles in the teaching program are instructors who know what it means to function as a foreigner in the target culture -- who intimately understand from experience the linguistic and cultural problems students will encounter in the classroom and abroad. They are also aware of variation in the foreign language and culture that cannot be represented by any individual native speaker. Their ability to identify with the students because of a common native language and culture provides an important ingredient of understanding and reassurance. A representative of either side teaching alone necessarily works against unavoidable disadvantages for which appropriate countermeasures should be taken.

I hasten to point out that the team-teaching paradigm I am advocating is definitely not the linguist-informant paradigm that was common a number of years ago. In a program that is team-taught, the participating staff members perform complementary teaching functions, with the role of the native speaker of the target language steadily increasing with the student's proficiency. At the advanced level, that instructor may function almost independently. The program coordinator may be a representative of either side.

Tenured and Non-Tenured Instructors

While there will undoubtedly always be some paraprofessionals in language programs, it is assumed that instructors with solid academic credentials will constitute the core of the teaching team. These faculty members hold regular tenure-track professorial positions. However, the paraprofessionals, lacking the advanced degrees required by most schools, are rarely eligible for tenure. This frequently creates friction among untenured staff with academic credentials that are judged insufficient for tenure, but it is doubtful that requirements will be relaxed and questionable that they should be. Many institutions have established a long-term "senior lecturer" category for the experienced paraprofessional, but tenure will probably continue to be unattainable unless all formal requirements are met, and these formal requirements entail academic credentials in relevant disciplines. However, I deplore any language teaching situation in which tenure is denied skilled and talented paraprofessional pedagogues but is granted to pedagogically deficient colleagues on the basis of academic degrees in other disciplines. This is indeed a clear 'grievance' situation, and when it occurs, it deserves the immediate attention of the administration.

Given the critical need for upgrading language pedagogy, it is disappointing to note the continuing lack of substantive professional interest. How many panels on Japanese literature, theoretical linguistics, and sociolinguistics are presented at professional meetings in contrast to the number of panels on Japanese language pedagogy? I suspect that our conference today represents a first for this particular category, and Ronald Morse and the Woodrow Wilson Center are to be congratulated for their appreciation of the importance of the subject.

The Need for Evaluation

Evaluation affords a clear opportunity to check on the

results of a program, but the nature of the evaluation itself is crucial. This is clearly another facet of foreign language pedagogy that requires expertise.

Examiners must be able to justify a language examination in terms of its relevance to student performance in the real world. A requirement to write isolated characters may well ensure the students' ability to recognize those same symbols, but is this any guarantee of an ability to read a text? Here, again, the importance of the identification of the goals of training becomes obvious. Are the skills the course aims to teach the same skills that are being tested? Is the student who is learning to speak actually required to speak when examined? Unfortunately, an ineffective course can be put in an extremely favorable light by administering an equally ineffective examination.

Even the most sophisticated test will, of course, display certain shortcomings. However, a general trend in the results should be considered significant. Regrettably, instructors sometimes fear that poor student performance necessarily reflects on the quality of their teaching. If the test is skillfully prepared, overall student results <u>are</u> meaningful, but poor results may stem from a number of causes -- low student aptitude, poor student application, unrelated curriculum -- aside from ineffective teaching. The point to be stressed is that performance evaluation demands professionalism. If that requirement is met, test results can indeed provide valuable data that should be sought after, not avoided.

Of the three languages under discussion here today, Japanese is the only one for which an objective test has been developed by the Educational Testing Service. The test development project thus far covers only the receptive skills -- i.e., reading and oral comprehension. But widespread use of this test, with detailed language histories of the test subjects, can undoubtedly provide the field with useful pedagogical data.

Prudent Innovation

Since improvement involves change, we have suggested innovation as our third topic of discussion. On the one hand, one can certainly deplore its general absence in many academic institutions across the country. It is not difficult to locate programs that use the same approach and the same techniques year after year. Instructors who 'also teach language' often simply perpetuate the methodology used when they themselves were acquiring the language. These are the individuals for whom experience equates with repetition rather than growth.

But innovation for its own sake can be dangerous. New methodologies that are springing up around the country which make dramatic claims for rapid, easy, painless acquisition of a foreign language and which emphasize a non-critical attitude of the teacher should be carefully checked before they are adopted. In this culture of ours that loves instant results and new gimmicks, wild claims find a ready market. Some instant weight-loss programs have been known to kill unsuspecting victims; and those dramatic results achieved at the outset, doctors tell us, reflect simple dehydration rather than true weight loss (which comes only from honest-to-goodness reduction of caloric intake, continuing effort, and strict self-discipline). Similarly, unsuspecting would-be language learners who are lured into a study program advertised as effortless and speedy -- "you too can be fluent after just a few days" -- are asking for victimization. The claim that vast numbers of vocabulary items can be mastered in record time should make a potential student read the fine print: what kind of vocabulary is included and, more importantly, how will such vocabulary acquisition be integrated into the learning of the Japanese language? Once I have learned the phonological system of Japanese, I can of course quickly acquire a vast vocabulary of English borrowings, from hanbaagaa ("hamburger") and appurupai ("apple pie") to karutyua-syokku ("culture shock") and zenereesyon-gyappu ("generation gap"). But have I really acquired anything beyond phonological competence? What have I learned about the utilization of these words within the Japanese language, in anything beyond a "you Tarzan, me Jane" level of communication? The Japanese language involves much more than nouns borrowed from English, embedded in a framework of pointing.

There are of course other innovative methods that do go far beyond word lists. But many include a worrisome stress on student-generated material, teacher withdrawal, minimal correction, and -- again -- effortlessness and relaxation. Most beginning students know precious little about the cultural setting of the East Asian language they are studying: to suggest that they tell a native instructor in English what they want to say in Japanese has troublesome implications too numerous to list. Consider also an innovative approach that places emphasis on carrying out preposterous commands given in the target language. These include linguistic combinations that would certainly never occur under ordinary circumstances in real life, since many of the utterances depend on the arbitrary transfer of abstract vocabulary to concrete objects. Thus by assigning "love" to a key, I may ask a student to "throw love," "drop love," "put love in your pocket," etc. Linguistic, sociolinguistic, and communicative implications are completely ignored

in a format that totally divorces itself from reality but misleads unsuspecting students into thinking they are acquiring a useful skill. Do we recommend that prospective real estate brokers study for their license by playing Monopoly? The new methodologies which seem most promising for the East Asian field are those that reflect a serious concern for the social setting in which language is used, stressing communicative competence.

The Limitations of Immersion

Exchange programs in Japan for pre-college students are furnishing us with useful data on the results of elementary, student-generated language acquisition programs utilizing native models and characterized by constant encouragement and minimal correction. High aptitude students with a natural gift for foreign language learning are not a problem. But more often these student-returnees have acquired a variety of Japanese that requires remedial training, and the persistence of their problems suggests that the goals of remedial foreign language training may unfortunately be a myth. These students, whose Japanese poses a range of problems extending in some cases all the way to "abominable fluency," may be incurable. Correction and improvement of inaccurate usage that has been deeply ingrained may be possible within the classroom, but as soon as these speakers return to the real world where the message reasserts its primacy over the medium, old habits become dominant. How vastly different is the ultimate language proficiency of a student who undergoes a sophisticated language program before going to the foreign culture!

Yet we continue to encounter claims that the only place to learn a foreign language is within the foreign culture, and that all we need is more exchange programs. While programs abroad provide an unmatched motivating force for the study of foreign languages and cultures and the most appropriate setting for advanced oral training, the professional language pedagogues I know all believe that the pure, unsullied beginner is the student with the greater ultimate potential. Unless the Japanese language learner has unusual talent and/or significant background in foreign language acquisition, our advice should always be "start here, continue there," assuming that the "start here" is not a replica of a random approach there.(1) Our exchange programs -- particularly those for

---

1 A third alternative, "start there -- in a program" will be discussed this afternoon.

high school students -- should make a more serious effort to provide relevant linguistic and cultural orientation for participants before they leave this country. One week of drill on Japanese greetings by a Japanese tutor in Japan is not a satisfactory alternative. Above all they should receive guidance on how to go about the task of studying the language productively while they are abroad.

The chances that an individual will "pick up" a foreign language within the culture decrease as age increases. Young teenagers newly introduced to a language in situ can indeed become accurately fluent within the limited range of their experience, but they have already missed out on the initial years of exposure enjoyed by the native. They will require conscious and deliberate training in order to achieve advanced proficiency, and in the interest of rapid and significant progress, a well-organized, systematic approach is more efficient than reliance on random linguistic encounters. The transition from unconscious to conscious acquisition is often difficult for these students. To become aware of how the jigsaw pieces of a foreign language interlock to form a unified picture can also be extremely difficult. Unfortunately, many products even of our advanced language training programs have never been made aware of the fact that the pieces do indeed fit together in a systematic way.

Instructional Materials

This introduces another component of the language package that requires discussion. Thus far I have concentrated my attention on the instructor and the student. But we must not ignore the third major component -- the instructional materials. For while it is true that a skilled pedagogue can compensate for a mediocre textbook, and conversely, a sophisticated text can prevent irreparable damage by a less than satisfactory teacher, it is equally true that really beautiful and uplifting music is heard only when both the artist and the score are superior.

What is a good language textbook? It is a skillful blend of accurate target language samples that are relevant to the foreigner, with accurate, systematic linguistic and cultural analysis that satifies the foreign language learner. Its production requires a conscious awareness of goals, highly specialized skill in pedagogical linguistics, and an intimate understanding of the needs of the foreigner in the target culture. Once again I see a critical requirement for a team representing both the target and the base language and culture.

Most professionals would, I am sure, agree that a perfect language textbook has never been written. But it is equally clear that those that are available represent a range from quite good to very bad. An important qualification of the skilled, professionally trained instructor is the ability to make valid judgments in this area and select accordingly.

If I were to describe what I look for in a language textbook, I would list the following:

(1) It should define its goals clearly and relate every part of the book to those goals.

(2) It should reflect an awareness of the native language and culture of the foreign user for whom it is designed.

(3) The linguistic material that is introduced should reflect the language as it is actually used by natives within the society. It must not be tampered with; it must not be a specially created dialect for foreigners, reflecting distortions that are based on an attempt to make the foreign language seem like the native language of the foreign students; and it must not be a special dialect that is "more beautiful" than real language.

(4) Explanations of structure should be accurate and sufficiently detailed <u>for the foreigner</u>. They should reflect the overall system that is Japanese: explanations should not be equated simply with the furnishing of an equivalent in the students' native language. Explanations must also be consistent: the statements of page 20 should not be contradicted by the further explanation on page 120.

(5) At every step, students must be made aware of the situational relevance of the language they are learning. The textbook writer who is a native speaker of the target language must beware of making assumptions about clarity and obviousness. Much information that is assigned to the "everybody knows" category may actually belong in the "every native knows" category. Clearly the textbook is not being written for target-language native speakers.

(6) The nitty-gritty requirements of language textbook preparation must also be met: i.e., the correct proportion of drill material to new structure and

> vocabulary; the repeated reintroduction of old material for reinforcement; the effective ordering of material in terms of both complexity and frequency of occurrence; the appropriate matching of the language with the culture; the constant awareness of what is new for the student as opposed to what has already been introduced.

One worrisome response to textbook weaknesses has been the all-too-casual suggestion that language instructors produce supplementary materials. This may sound like sensible and obvious advice, but textbook writing is complex, and relatively few language instructors are qualified to fill this assignment. Does the study of Shakespeare or of Noh drama or even of theoretical linguistics automatically prepare one to write pedagogical grammar notes or dialogues or drills? What provisions does our field make for the study of textbook-writing and the sharing of professionally reliable information?

It becomes increasingly obvious that well-planned summer workshops for subjects related to the problems we are discussing here today -- teacher training, evaluation, materials preparation -- could have a widespread effect on the field as a whole. It should not be impossible to arrange them.

Video Breakthroughs

For advanced students, weaning from specially prepared materials should be complete. What possible justification is there for keeping them separated from the real world of the Japanese language as it is used among Japanese? Materials useful for reading instruction are all around us, and the current availability of Japanese television programs on videotape represents an exciting breakthrough for advanced oral training. I must mention our deep gratitude to the Japan Foundation, through whose auspices selected videotapes are about to be made available to academic institutions throughout the country.

The field should view the development of useful teaching techniques for this medium as a challenge. For instructors and students simply to observe the films together and conduct random discussions is obviously not the solution. One initial requirement for the instructor is the ability to identify the linguistic level of difficulty of such tapes in order to utilize them at an appropriate stage of training. The goal here is to avoid a recurring error of reading classes, i.e., having students try to cope with material far too difficult for them, with countless new vocabulary items on every page. Such

students are obviously not reading the material; they are decoding and at the same time possibly developing an intense dislike of dealing with the Japanese written word. Video classes can be exciting and interesting, but only when the material is challenging without being overwhelming. If programs are completely incomprehensible to students without a lengthy vocabulary list or, even worse, without the entire script written out to be laboriously pored over, they are too difficult. Often the script provided for the students is written out in an advanced orthography that many cannot handle. This further distracts from the task at hand, which is to develop advanced oral skills. Television is for watching. Beware lest this medium too be swallowed up by the readers. Reading for the sake of reading needs no justification; but when the written word is allowed to become a crutch for graphically-oriented students who are unable to comprehend the spoken language, it can only perpetuate linguistic crippling.

Thanks to the activity of the very recent past, there does seem to be an increased awareness of the importance of foreign language study. But if we are to utilize this trend productively, we must take a long, hard look at what is happening in our classrooms. Recent figures from the MLA indicate that Japanese enrollments over the past four years have increased in two-year colleges. Does this suggest growing interest in the more practical applications of foreign-language study? If so, isn't there the necessity to develop at four-year colleges and in graduate programs more sophisticated programs in this area? Isn't there a need to examine all our programs constantly, to identify problem areas, to eliminate whatever is ineffective, and to develop and further improve useful pedagogical approaches?

In conclusion, I would like to suggest that every language instructor should be able to begin every language course with the following announcement:

> "Students, I have good news and bad news. The good news is that, thanks to the significant knowledge I gained from my last year's experience, the course that is about to begin will be significantly superior -- hopefully, the best I have ever offered. The bad news is that, since I expect to learn much from my experience with you this year, the course that is about to begir will unfortunately be inferior to all courses I offer in the years to come."

TEACHING KOREAN IN AMERICA TODAY

S. Robert Ramsey

I would like to thank the Wilson Center for giving me an opportunity to speak about Korean. The inclusion of Korea in a conference of this sort represents what I believe to be an understanding of East Asia that is unfortunately still too rare.

A colleague of mine at Columbia once gave a lecture on East Asian civilization, and to advertise it, he posted copies of a hand-drawn map of East Asia around the campus. He had his students spread the story that there was something wrong with the map in order to make people curious enough to attend. Hundreds of students must have seen the posters. He began the lecture itself by asking the question, "What is wrong with this map?" The several students of Korean in the audience (who had been forewarned) said nothing. Of the fifty or sixty other people who were present, only one person volunteered an answer. She had noticed that the compass drawn on the map had been misaligned. After this one answer there was only silence. Apparently, not a single person there had noticed that the entire country of Korea had been left off the map! (Vladivostok was connected to the Liaodong Peninsula.) Upon reflection few would deny that this "third man" is a legitimate member of the East Asian community. But even professional East Asianists are usually so caught up in either China or Japan -- one or the other but very rarely both -- that it is difficult to escape from a "country orientation" to a view of this part of the world as a whole.

Imagine for a moment what East Asia would be like if that map had represented reality. Even from a superficial, purely geographical point of view, we can see that there would not simply be an East Asia composed of China and Japan. Anyone who has taken one of those marvelous ferry rides from Pusan to Shimonoseki knows how truly intimately Korea connects China and Japan. One is literally almost never out of sight of land on that whole 115-mile trip past the islands of Tsushima and, sometimes, Iki. One docks in Shimonoseki with a new respect for the interconnections of East Asia. On the other hand, consider what the situation would be like without Korea. At their closest point, China and Japan would be separated by more than 500 miles of open and often stormy and treacherous seas, farther than Luzon is from Swatow.

Korea's Image Problem

Why, then, is Korea included in so few East Asian programs in this country? The recent creation of two new Korean programs -- one on the east coast and one on the west coast -- has brought the total of American universities offering regular,

full-time instruction in the Korean language only up to eight. Other institutions offer courses in the language occasionally in response to direct student request, but these halfway measures have satisfied few needs, either individual or national.

By any objective, international standard, Korea is not a small or unimportant country. If the northernmost point of North Korea were placed around Buffalo, New York, the southernmost point of South Korea would just reach Plains, Georgia. In population, Korea is just about the size of France or Spain -- or half the size of Japan. The Korean language in fact is the fourteenth largest language in the world. Korea's traditional culture is as old as any, except of course that of her mighty neighbor China. And although Korea has been politically divided since 1945, before that, she had been a single, unified nation since 668, far longer than any of the modern European countries. Some say that Korea is overshadowed by the giants around her, and it is true that she could never compare in importance to China, Japan, or the Soviet Union. But her strategic location should make her all that much more important to us.

In my view, part of Korea's problem has been her image. For most Americans Korea has had unpleasant associations ever since the Korean War, and many have undoubtedly wished the country would just go away. Even today, more than thirty years later, only the Middle East can match Korea as a potential trouble spot. The reported firing by the North Koreans of a ground-to-air missile at one of our spy planes a few weeks ago is only the most recent example of the strange stories that come out of that corner of the world with alarming regularity. On that one peninsula, there are more men under arms today than there are on both of the continents of Africa and South America combined. The mention of Korea raises blood pressure in the State Department and stirs the adrenalin of the Pentagon budget planners, but it is not something that has so far attracted large numbers of young Americans to study Korean language and culture.

Very few native-born Americans have been or are being trained in fields related to Korea. In many sectors of American business, government, and scholarship we have come to rely almost exclusively upon experts from South Korea. These people are certainly qualified for their jobs, and their intelligence, skill, and loyalty are not in question. But, at the same time, our overdependence has created a subculture isolated from the mainstream of American life. At the very least, we need to have some individuals from other ethnic groups with some expertise and knowledge about Korea.

Korean-Americans and the Demand for Korean

Korean language teaching especially needs our attention. The situation in this field has changed completely over the past decade or so. To many of you it may come as a surprise to know that the demand for Korean and Korea-related courses has been steadily rising and that the number of students in our classes has increased significantly. But these changes do not reflect increased attention from a broad segment of our society. The widespread apathy on the part of most Americans towards Korea has not yet changed. The reason, rather, is the growing Korean community in this country. Highly educated and increasingly influential in the university system, these new Americans are passionately concerned about their ethnic image and therefore about Korean studies as well. They have already begun to make their presence felt. This development is most welcome. There are very real opportunities here that we cannot afford to miss. But, at the same time, without the understanding and help of their countrymen, the efforts of these Korean-Americans could be wasted and may even lower the quality of education in our East Asian programs. They need our help, and we certainly need theirs. Cooperation is essential and could transform the Korean community into our greatest resource for Korean studies. But without cooperation, all of our best efforts may be in vain.

The Korean-American community, then, is the background against which Korean studies in this country must now be seen. We native-born Americans need to learn more about them.

In the late sixties and early seventies, there began an exodus of professionals from South Korea. Doctors, nurses, technicians, and engineers, as well as a large number of academics, emigrated from that country and settled with their families here and in Canada. South Korea lost much of the cream of her talent. For a number of years during the early seventies, in fact, Korea was the world's leading exporter of medical personnel. Although the American immigration authorities have in recent years lowered the quotas for certain professions, such as medical doctors, the trend towards immigration in the most productive levels of Korean society is continuing and will probably last at least through the end of the century. Today there are over 600,000 Korean immigrants living in this country, and very early in the twenty-first century that number will most certainly pass the million mark.

On the whole these Korean-Americans are an unusally ambitious and successful group of citizens. Most of them are middle- and upper-middle-class people who more often than not

had already achieved success in Korea before emigrating. According to a survey made about three years ago, a sizable majority of Korean immigrants have incomes that exceed the American average by 20% or more within five years of their arrival in this country. But much more significant and impressive than their economic success is their educational level. An astonishing 92% of those Korean-Americans surveyed over the age of twenty-two were college graduates, and 32% of those over twenty-five had graduate degrees. These figures seem to me to be inordinately high, but if the statistical sampling of this survey was anywhere near representative, then it suggests that Korean-Americans are intellectually exceptional indeed. In any event, it is virtually certain that they all have even higher educational ambitions for their children. And, since almost 60% of their population are of school age or younger, this means that about 360,000 of those Koreans in this country today will sooner or later pass through our universities. That number will of course rise as immigration continues.

Korean childen go to the best schools. Look at the entering classes of MIT, Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Cornell, Brown, Berkeley, Stanford, or Columbia. They always contain a good number of Korean-Americans. These students do not go to university to study Korean, of course; they go there to major in much more competitive and lucrative fields -- business, engineering, science, medicine, law. But once there, many of them will take courses in Korean and Korea-related subjects if at all possible. They are strongly urged to take these courses by their parents and by the rest of the Korean-American community. This has greatly increased Korean enrollments. Columbia, for example, has never encouraged what students sometimes call "identity-tripping," and yet there were twenty Korean-Americans in our basic courses last year. This year there are almost thirty. If the courses are advertised at all among students and Korean-American organizations, the enrollments can rise much higher. This has recently happened at the University of Pennsylvania, for example, where newly inaugurated Korean courses are nearly twice as large as Columbia's. This pattern appeared some time ago in our Chinese classes, of course, and much of the growth in Chinese enrollments that has taken place over the past ten to fifteen years can be attributed to the increasing numbers of ethnic Chinese in the courses. But Chinese-Americans have had a much smaller relative effect upon the teaching of Chinese simply because non-Chinese interest and enrollment has always been high. In Korean courses the Korean-American contingent is now completely dominant.

Korean Classes Then and Now

In the sixties and early seventies, Korean classes often resembled graduate seminars. They consisted mostly of small groups of highly motivated graduate students who came to the class with a broad range of backgrounds and experiences. Some students had served in the Peace Corps, others in the military, and many had already studied another East Asian language. In those days the average student of Korean studied the language primarily because he wanted to use it as a research tool.

To anyone who remembers what those classes used to be like, a Korean class today can come as a surprise. The change is obvious the minute one sets foot in the door. The classes are larger these days, and the faces of the students are young and Asian. The non-Korean students are a tiny minority now; at the most there might be two or three in a class of around ten, and sometimes there are none at all. The atmosphere has also changed. The way the classes are conducted and the themes of examples, drills, and discussions often have a very different slant. Part of this difference simply reflects the graduate student-oriented past and the undergraduate-oriented present. The two groups, after all, have different interests. But some aspects of these changes create problems. Let us look briefly at what has been happening to Korean teaching in America.

Korean language instruction is often modelled upon the teaching of Japanese, and this approach is very reasonable, especially from a linguistic point of view. Anyone familiar with both Japanese and Korean cannot fail to be struck by the remarkable structural similarity between the two languages. It is often possible to translate sentences morpheme by morpheme from one language to the other with little perceptible damage to the structure of either. Even idiomatic expression and metaphors in one language often have direct equivalents in the other . Many of the sociolinguistic problems are also similar, particularly for American students. Thus it is natural that there should be coordination between Korean teaching and Japanese teaching, and anyone responsible for a Korean program should also be familiar with the situation in the Japanese teaching field. Moreover, resources for Japanese instruction are incomparably greater than those available for Korean instruction, and lessons from the first field should be applied in the second.

Logistical Problems

But, as might be expected, progress made in Korean studies sometimes lags behind progress in Japanese. Materials can be a problem. Some educators are using basic text materials first written around the time of the Korean War and still being published today. The sentence patterns in this text had obviously been made up by translation from English, and some of them were quite ungrammatical, at least in the social situations where they were supposed to be used. Worse, many created a classroom situation that was often embarrassing for the native speaker who had to do the drills. A much more satisfactory text is Martin and Lee's Beginning Korean (Yale: 1969), where the presentation of grammar is linguistically quite sound. But more detailed and easy to use drills and supporting materials have been compiled and are published by the Myongdo Language Institute. These Myongdo materials, however, are difficult to order and the shipping times are often intolerably long, since they are published only in Seoul and since there is no American distributor. Fred Lukoff at the University of Washington has been working on new materials for a number of years, but they have yet to be published. The texts and tapes made available by the Foreign Service Institute are probably the most convenient package. But, to sum up the situation, there is still nothing in the Korean field to compare with Jorden's Beginning Japanese.

Also, trained "pedalinguists" -- that is, linguists who specialize in pedagogy -- are very few in number. There are, of course, a large number of Korean linguists on the faculties of American universities, and they are sometimes called upon to teach language courses, Japanese as well as Korean. But their training and interests almost always lie in theoretical linguistics or semantics -- the philosophy of language, not the teaching of language.

The New Ethnic Mix

In addition to these long-standing problems, we now must accommodate the new ethnic mix in our classrooms. A non-Korean with little or no previous background in Korean culture can be intimidated in a class full of Korean-Americans. They seem to know so much more. Sometimes such a student's fears are well-founded, for Korean-Americans sometimes manage to enroll in classes far below the level of their proficiency. I once visited a second-year class in which one student was clearly a native speaker of Korean, not of English. This was a serious mistake. Teachers and administrators must screen such

people out. But even when the Korean-Americans do not know the first word of Korean, they can sometimes form a cultural clique that can be discouraging for their one or two non-Korean classmates. In such cases the burden of maintaining a proper balance in the class falls squarely upon the teacher. The difficulty of this task represents one more argument for properly trained instructors.

Yet the national pride and sensitivity that can surface in a Korean class must be handled delicately. Many of the children raised to maturity in this country still bear the scars of the colonial period and may resist the introduction of materials or topics which smack of China or Japan. The writing system is especially a problem. In South Korea the use or abolition of Chinese characters is a highly-charged political issue. In some circles Chinese characters are treated as symbols of cultural oppression, and students who have grown up in households where the parents or grandparents hold such views will often resist the introduction of any writing not done completely in the native alphabet. In fact, Chinese characters need not and should not be taught in a beginning class. The fundamental patterns of Korean are difficult enough to master without introducing the complexities of the Chinese writing system. But eventually a student must learn a number of Chinese characters if he is to be literate. A wide variety of South Korean publications, including the daily newspapers, are still printed in Chinese. To read some government publications, a student must almost be versed in Classical Chinese. China and Japan are both linked to Korea in ways too intimate to be neatly cut off.

But these technical difficulties caused by new classroom situations should not distract our attention from the overwhelmingly positive nature of most changes. We must improve our materials and techniques and train our teachers in how to apply them. Yet the potential of the younger generation of Korean-Americans as students of the Korean language is beyond question. They are bright and young, and, with the exception of the inevitable laggard or two who are only in the class because of parental insistence, they are enthusiastic about the language.

Funding During an Economic Crunch

Korean immigration has thus generated an increased demand for Korean language in our universities. Unfortunately, this growth in demand comes at a time when curricula in the humanities are shrinking, not expanding. Administrations welcome

the growth of existing courses, but they can prove very reluctant to create new ones. They do not often heed student requests for such courses. One instance particularly well known to me occurred in 1974 at Yale, when a group of Korean-American students submitted a petition requesting that the university offer a course in Korean. About fifteen to twenty students had signed the petition and had pledged themselves to take the course were it to be offered. But the administration of the university and Yale College refused their request without a hearing. They considered the possibility of creating a new language course at a time when they were having so many headaches from the existing ethnic programs out of the question. The entire Southeast Asian Department had just been abolished, and one could hardly expect the administration to be very sanguine about the prospects for Korean. Many other universities have had similar experiences, and although the number of Korean-American students in our school system has increased greatly since 1974, administrative attitudes have changed very little. More receptive administrators would see that not only students, but also funds for such courses, are often available. But during budget crises, even our better universities are seldom in a mood to think imaginatively about their curricula.

However, even without adequate planning by our universities, Korean courses are sometimes started when funding is offered. Those of us who believe in teaching East Asian civization would wish such growth to take place in already existing, strong East Asian departments, but that does not always happen. Opportunities can arise in the wrong places. Quite recently, funds have been raised for a Korean studies program at a university which has never had a real East Asian program. Indeed, this university's principal qualification for Korean support seems to be the presence in its immediate vicinity of a large Korean-American community. The value of this project is dubious at best. Whatever local benefit for community relations this program may bring, it is clear that in terms of our national priorities, the program would have been more useful elsewhere.

The proper place for Korean studies is at a university with a commitment to East Asia, just as the proper place for a particle accelerator is at an institution with a strong program in nuclear physics. We cannot expect Koreans to think and plan along these lines. It is the universities with commitments to East Asia which must think about strengthening and developing their overall curricula and programs. The recent donations of a Korean businessman and the Korean Traders' Association towards the expansion of the East Asian library facilities at Columbia illustrate what can be done. The

immediate gain of that expansion was the creation of shelf space for the hopelessly cramped Korean collection. This in turn made possible more space and better facilities for the other collections as well. Opportunities exist, but if we neglect them, Korean studies may become like a shantytown in a city without zoning laws.

We must also realize that without care even resources in the right places can be misused. Several years ago some Korean religious organizations (not the Unification Church but rather more orthodox Christian groups) offered a major university funding for one or two faculty appointments in Korean studies. Part of the money had been raised through contributions, and part came from the South Korean Ministry of Education. These church groups presumably offered the money in good faith; and their principal consideration was surely to enhance the field of Korean studies outside of Korea. However, since they had raised the money, they insisted on having a say in the appointments. There was no strong opposition from the East Asian department where this Korean program would be housed, and so the university accepted the proposed appointments. The people hired were dedicated and hard working, but their academic credentials were most questionable. One in fact had been primarily trained in Christian theology and was a minister at one of the local Korean churches! One wonders if the same department would have accepted a person with similar credentials to teach courses in Japanese or Chinese. The Korean-American community provided a base of support for Korean studies in this case, but little of real value came from it, because no group within the university, including the East Asian department, was willing to take an interest in the quality of Korean education.

The teaching of Korean in this country can be strengthened only to the extent that people in our universities and in our government are concerned about it. That concern cannot come only from those with expertise and special research interests in Korea. Such people are too few in number to make their voices heard. There must be at least an awareness of Korea on the part of those in other East Asian fields as well. We East Asianists are all in this together. Whether we are primarily interested in China, Japan, or Korea, we are all studying aspects of the same civilization. What happens in one of our fields affects those in the others. What is needed most of all is coordination and planning with a view toward the state of East Asian studies as a whole.

CHINESE LANGUAGE TEACHING IN THE UNITED STATES

DEMAND, NEEDS, AND RESPONSES

James J. Wrenn

It is appropriate for me, as someone who did not participate in the task forces of the Modern Language Association and the American Council of Learned Societies, to begin by endorsing the series of recommendations made by those task forces and to point out that many of the comments I will make will reflect aspects already touched on in these reports.(1)

I will also make reference to a recent State-of-the-Art report on Chinese Language in American Higher Education that I prepared with Peter Eddy and Sophia Behrens, and the recommendations made there.(2)

The Supply-Demand Gap

If we look first at the goals for the year 1988 established in the MLA-ACLS report, we find that for Chinese, there is an estimate of 100,000 projected enrollments, based on several indicators: the enrollments for 1977 (9,809); the pattern of growth up to 1977; the available materials; the availability of a supply of trained teachers; and the language priorities given in their survey data. This projection takes into account both two-year and four-year institutions and represents a tenfold growth in enrollment.

If we compare this estimate of 100,000 enrollments with projected staff openings described in the State-of-the-Art paper, we find an discrepancy between numbers of students and of those who will teach them:

> With respect to the possibility of Chinese language-teaching openings in tenure-track positions over the next 5 years, about 55% of our respondents forsee none; a total of 38 openings are forecast by 26 different institutions, 21 of which predict they will have one opening only over the next 5 years. Five such openings were forecast by NDEA centers, 5 by large universities without centers, 7 by smaller universities, 2 in four-year colleges, and 2 in two-year colleges.
>
> Approximately 48% of our responding institutions foresee no opening over the next 5 years for Chinese language teachers on fixed-year contracts. Thirty-seven institutions indicated that they would probably be hiring at least 1 Chinese language instructor on a fixed-year contract over the next 5 years, the total number of possible openings being

12. A number of institutions appeared to be including openings for teaching assistant positions in this total. For the most part, institutions reported that only 1 fixed-year contract vacancy would occur; such was the case with 2 NDEA centers, 12 large universities, 7 smaller universities, 3 four-year colleges, and 4 two-year colleges.(3)

It is clear from the above that the projections for Chinese language enrollments cannot be met by existing programs with the staff, materials, and curricula that they are now using. A new influx of staff, beyond that projected by the institutions surveyed, and new types of material must be planned for and funded.

How Can We Pay?

Academic institutions are themselves under serious pressures not only from the limitations on the generosity of private individuals, but from inflationary pressure on their investments, the rising cost of fuel, and from state legislatures that are reeling from the effects of curbs on federal spending and on voter reaction to higher taxes. All academic institutions are limiting expansion, especially into areas that may seem to compete with the already established programs they must fund, even though at reduced levels.

Present political patterns suggest that government will be less willing to offer direct support of individuals or programs and that the incentive for private individuals to support university programs may be inhibited by governmental tax policies.

Some businesses support foundations and underwrite institutional support of private and public education -- to a limited extent. Many businesses will support efforts capable of boosting sales or encouraging development, such as programs by which they supply equipment or software that will increase familiarity or dependence on, and loyalty to, their particular products or systems.

But we will not be able to meet national expectations and needs unless we do have better support from business, government, and from our colleagues in academic administration who set institutional priorities and allocate institutional resources.

The academic establishment does not have the funds to reallocate in support of the expansion that we believe is necessary, and government is taking a direction away from funding these programs, directly or indirectly. Direct funding from corporations may appear to be a possibility, and certainly the development of a broad base of skills in oriental languages represents "capital formation" of a significant sort. But business needs to be assured that such capital formation is worthwhile and usually expects to see payoffs before this country and its academic programs will be able to develop the the capacity for training that we need.

This is the problem: we know that the need exists, but we can't find out who will pay to do the job. It is clear that without some exercise of enlightened self-interest on the part of government agencies, private sources of funds including corporations and foundations, or from the reallocation of priorities on the part of many institutions of the academic establishment, there will be little progress in the advancement of the teaching of Chinese.

The communications media and the manufactures of their equipment have a clear role to play in educational innovation, and they are prepared to play it. The Workshop for Children's Television is one of the better known public ventures, but there are many publishing companies that produce on a smaller scale for classroom use. But these industries will not produce unless a market is identified, and a clear plan for instruction prepared. Some risks may need to be taken in the early stages of this development, and persuasive arguments made for the priorities for efficient teaching that these media provide. Only in this way will the costs of developmental risk be acceptable.

Obstacles to Performance Standards

Let us look at some of the problems that we must deal with before going on to assess what the particular areas in which we may need the most help and support. We may share some of these problems with our colleagues who teach other oriental languages, but some are unique to Chinese. Only after obtaining a better sense of the problems can we go on to develop strategies for dealing with them, while identifying targets of the highest priority.

Chinese, even more than other fields, needs some degree of consensus on performance standards for our students. We all feel that students should be competent in Chinese, but

agreement stops there. Individual teachers legitimately place different relative emphases upon the skills of speaking, hearing, writing and reading. Students have many different reasons for learning different kinds of Chinese, ancient and modern, formal and vernacular, scientific or humanistic or practical. This melange of interests, all justifiable, has tended to prevent us from defining standards. Thus, we need to define the differences among language skills and among varieties of languages, along with the competences required for each. We will need help in this definition from experienced testing specialists (which few of us claim to be) and from our colleagues (who will be called on to help make distinctions which we do not ordinarily make). We also need assistance in shaping definitions and distinctions in terms which we may initially find unfamiliar.

No matter how difficult we find it, we must bring the profession to accept the development of standards based on performance in particular real tasks, rather than those based on response to set text materials, and we must work toward a set of uniform tests that will reflect the standards we have chosen. We must reduce the unreasoning fear that lies just under the surface for many -- the fear that such standards will destroy creativity and freedom to teach. In fact, developing standards will give us clearer goals to work toward.

There are some real difficulties in the development of standards that cannot be avoided. They derive from dialect differences among Chinese-speaking communities and from differences in orthography -- the way Chinese is written in its different homes. Another difficulty resides in the attitudes of many of our teachers. Their training and cultural background make the acceptance of, and contribution to, the development of standards more difficult than they are among members of a culture where standards of the sort we require are more widely accepted.

There is a wider range of dialect difference in China than in countries like Japan and Korea. In fact the differences between Chinese "dialects" can be as great as the differences between European "languages"; Cantonese must learn the speech of Shanghai or Beijing as a foreign language, just as Spaniards must learn Italian, or Englishmen must learn Dutch, as a foreign language. Culturally, the great tolerance for dialect differences among Chinese speakers complicates learning standard dialects for some of our learners whose families are ethnic Chinese from areas where "non-standard" dialects are spoken for they have never had to conform to formal rules. The presence of these non-standard speakers

in every Chinese community works against the continued reinforcement of the language standard and may, in some cases, even work against the adoption of a spoken language standard for teachers or graduate assistants.

Cultural and Political Barriers

Another set of differences that makes it difficult to apply standards is the distinction between the writing systems of the PRC and of Taiwan. Beijing has adopted "simplified" forms of many characters, but Taipei requires use of the more complex "full" forms of those characters in Taiwanese publications. This difficulty has been compounded by the unavailability until recently of materials printed in the PRC classroom using the new simplified forms and suitable for classroom use. Since the list of simplified characters is still open-ended, the authors and publishers of textbook materials have feared that their work might become obsolete too quickly.

More recently, there seems to be an acceptance that in America we may need to plan on teaching both the full and the simplified forms to all of our students and that the focus must now be on the strategies needed to make that learning most effective.

We have been fortunate in having a large pool of teachers from Taiwan available to our language programs, and we may soon be able to acquire a number of well-trained teachers from the PRC, coming through teacher exchanges or perhaps on a more permanent basis. The Cultural Revolution, with its four-year closing of the educational facilities, has had long-lasting after-effects -- particularly, freezing progress, lack of developments in pedagogy and emphasizing science to the exclusion of English and other languages. Thus we can expect that the teachers who come to us from the PRC will be different from those who now staff our programs. They will be a little older, will lack formal degree qualification, will probably be deficient in spoken English, and will need solid training in pedagogical technique.

We may also expect that the tensions of the past forty years that have erupted within the Chinese society will continue to manifest themselves in America and will require special sensitivity on the part of American teachers of Chinese and administrators of Chinese language programs.

Some of the effects of the years of tension in Chinese society have resulted in differences of cultural expectation,

in vocabulary usage, and even in the preference for certain grammatical constructions over others. Differences appear, too, in preferences among the romanized orthographies for Chinese Pinyin, Yale, Gwoyeu Roma Tzyh, Zhuyin Fuhao, or others. Many of these preferences, although intellectually defensible in one way or another, are really motivated by concern that one will appear "disloyal" to other members of the Chinese community. They are less pedagogical choices than political choices.

Another choice made by some who prepare materials, and by some programs, is the adoption of texts or recorded matter representing the norms of users in two or more Chinese-speaking areas. This diffuses anxiety about political biases in the classroom, and it does fill the needs of learners who will find themselves working or studying in more than one Chinese community. It does, however, give an ellipsoidal structure to the materials.

This set of cultural loyalties has limited the number of educators who have been willing to put time into the preparation of materials and has also limited the potential market for those that are developed, making the risks not only social, but financial as well.

It should be clear that the problems presented here are in part political and historical and in part educational and cultural. Teachers who come from the Chinese culture to teach American students will need special help in adjusting to conditions different from those in which their own competence has been developed, and the American institutions they teach in will need to show some flexibility with respect to academic degrees and English competency requirements and with respect to differences in cultural expectations. A comprehensive program of teacher training that offers instruction in the theory and practice of Chinese language teaching will be a necessity if we plan to meet the needs of the late 1980s.

Intensive, Not Only Extensive, Study

The shift toward greater enrollments in Chinese is well documented, but in addition to planning for these greater enrollments there is also the need to improve student competence earlier in their careers. Therefore, we need to encourage more <u>intensive</u> study of Chinese as well as more <u>extensive</u> study.

Language courses in most institutions are offered three times per week, but with Chinese it is almost impossible to develop a good foundation in the language in two years of classes with this schedule. Attempts to extend the requirement to five or six hours per week invariably prompt requests for double credit for such a course. It is an awkward fact that we are able to teach less in one year than our colleagues in the more commonly taught languages and are not able to deliver the same level of student competence in one year as they are. While this does not affect the highly motivated student who is sure that competence in Chinese is his or her goal, it does make for awkward choices: do we continue to offer the less-effective three hours per week; do we expand to six hours with single credit and represent ouselves as offering a course that is more nearly comparable to courses offered by our colleagues in the more commonly taught languages; or do we offer beginning courses with six hours of instruction and give double credit, thus giving the same level of competence, but for twice as much credit?

The latter two choices are both better than the first, but conscience and credits aside, both also require more staffing at the crucial beginning level of instruction. This means hiring additional faculty, reallocating the time of existing faculty, or a combination of both.

Given the increasing demand for Chinese language study and the decreasing opportunities for the employment of graduates with advanced degrees, the short-term administrative choice may be for reallocation, but this is only a short-term solution. We will need to look toward expanding the numbers of Chinese language teachers who are trained to teach Chinese to Americans at the beginning level.

How to Expand Staffs

One inexpensive scheme for staff expansion in Chinese is suggested by the excellent program of grants from the Japan Foundation for programs in Japanese studies. Grants are made to institutions for three years and pay two-thirds of the cost of salary and benefits per instructor for each of these three years. The grants require that the University commit itself to continue teaching in the branch of study for which the grant is made, although it need not continue to employ the same instructor. There is no commitment to a tenure-track position, so the institution can either continue the position with different instructors every three years, continue one instructor for a longer period, or open up the

position for a long-term appointment, depending on the success of the instructors. The grants may not be extended, and they must be applied for, with the institution making some financial commitment in each year. Variations on this theme are possible, but it provides an excellent long-term model for Chinese as well as Japanese.

When we have done the basic work of language preparation with whatever staffing and curricular arrangments have been possible for us and have brought students to a level of competence that will allow them to function in the Chinese culture, they should have the opportunity to advance their language skills while living in the area of that culture.

Immersion in the Culture

We need to have our students and our colleagues live in a Chinese-speaking environment, preferably one in which they are welcomed as participants. When such living and learning arrangements are provided on an exchange basis, the exchange should be as fair as individual, collegiate and governmental efforts can make them. I do not perceive discriminatory inflated pricing and extremely limited access to research facilities as fair elements in an academic exchange.

This period of training or retraining of students and faculty members who are not native speakers of Chinese in the Chinese-speaking community is a crucial part of their professional development. It is here that they have the time for the necessary extended practice in the language and the time and opportunity to develop the cultural sensitivity that fleshes out the text materials they will be using in language classes. Such a period of extended work or residence may also be necessary for ethnic Chinese who have spent their formative years outside of a Chinese community, or even for those who have been raised in a Chinese minority community outside of China.

This period of residence can often be arranged as part of the undergraduate program, with a 'Junior year abroad', or through some sort of institutional exchange, but relatively few students of Chinese possess as undergraduates the degree of professional commitment that makes this kind of an experience appropriate. At a later point, however, it is often even more difficult to arrange such a period of residence and study abroad.

Sometimes for the post-graduate student this difficulty results from his university's requirement that he take a particular sequence of courses during the first year or two of specialized study. Where this results in losing the best years for language study and the openness for language learning, we should urge more flexibility in the programs of specialization.

Sometimes the problem is one of financing and is related to institutional unwillingness to offer fellowship funds for study that is outside the regular curricular offering of the home institution, free of its supervision and often more amorphous in content than is usual in professional education in this country.

No matter what obstacles must be overcome, the period of residence and study in the Chinese culture is absolutely crucial in the "finishing" of the language teacher and is sometimes equally important for other specialists in the humanities and social sciences as well. Exchange opportunities must be widened, and funding both for residence and foreign travel to and from the area must be subsidized in some way, either through grants to individuals or to institutions for these purposes.

The program of subsidies for study abroad outlined in the recommendations of the MLA-ACLS task force is an excellent one. It emphasizes that the subsidies be limited to language training programs and that individuals who will profit from the subsidies also must pay a portion of the costs. The recommendations also urge that special low-cost air fares be authorized in order to make such study more feasible.

There is considerable disparity between the kind of expansion that we as a profession believe is desirable and what we consider likely or even possible. We want to be a long way from where we are, and we want to be there in a very short time.

We are unlikely to change the priorities of public and private institutions without paying for the changes we wish to effect, and we are unlikely to change them effectively unless we are sure of what we want and are prepared to plan for a longer period than just a few years.

We need to be aware that we can probably not add new teachers to the existing pool at a rapid rate and that there are problems of funding, of familiarzing governmental organizations and educational institutions to our needs, and of the competition of other, better-paying professions that limit the availability of talent to teaching positions in Chinese.

What can be done? We can urge public and private support for the development of standards that represent goals for us to reach, we can effect curricular adjustments that will make access to Chinese easier for some students, we can call for teacher training programs that will help us make more qualified teachers available, and we can call or arrange for support and subsidy of language students and language specialists in the Chinese speaking area.

What else can we do? We can improve access to Chinese language skills by keeping up with technological developments that will support the efforts of those who are already teaching Chinese, perhaps relieving them of some of the routine tasks in supplying models for auditory comprehension or for writing. We can add carefully designed materials that will enhance teacher skills, while making new skills available to students who would otherwise be unable to acquire them. We can seek to subsidize the cost of providing materials to individuals and institutions and of retraining teachers in their use, at costs that can be borne by institutions and individuals or communities.

We can make use of newly developed presentation devices such as the video disc and video systems available in schools and homes and through cable TV to teach in ways that we have only begun to explore.

The demand for instruction in Chinese is developing rapidly and we will need to meet this demand. We cannot do it without help from government, public and private foundations and individuals, and business and industry, particularly the communications industry. We can make every effort to improve our professional attitudes to assure that we are worthy of the support we seek. We look forward to doing this.

NOTES

1. Language Study for the 1980s. Reports of the MLA-ACLS Language Task Force. Richard I. Brod, Editor. New York, The Modern Language Association of America, 1980.

2. Chinese Language Study in American Higher Education: State-of-the-Art. LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION, THEORY AND PRACTICE, No. 30. Peter A. Eddy, James J. Wrenn, and Sophia A. Behrens, Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, 1980.

3. Ibid., p. 18.

III

James S. Noblitt

A. Ronald Walton

John L.D. Clark

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING TRAINING: WHOSE MOVE?

James S. Noblitt

Introduction

The remarks which follow reflect the way in which my attitudes toward a personal responsibility for foreign language teacher training have evolved over a number of years. My professional affiliation is with a department of linguistics, where I pursue research in second language acquisition. Although the applied aspects of my work have been devoted primarily to the teaching of French as a foreign language, I assume that at least some of my comments relate to the problems facing anyone with an interest in teacher training.

I feel obliged to insert a kind of disclaimer here. Whereas the synthesis presented may be in some ways new, the actual content includes no startling breakthrough or new discovery. In fact, our restless search for innovation can have the insidious result of diverting thought and energy from a more productive course of action. I intend to argue that the basic principles underlying effective teacher training are either surprisingly well known or easily discoverable in the professional literature. The major problem, in many cases, is that knowledge is simply not being utilized. There are, of course, reasons for this state of affairs; but those who are not content with the status quo must not, in my opinion, allow themselves to be enchanted by the promise of a simple solution. I know of no plan for significant improvement of foreign language teaching which does not involve a considerable investment of time, effort, and creative thought.

Background

I have come to rely on the Modern Language Association for periodic asessments of the state-of-the-art in language education. The MLA's most recent publication in this area, The Teaching Apprentice Program in Language and Literature by Joseph Gibaldi and James V. Mirollo (1981), contains information of particular interest to my topic, since it addresses directly the question of professionalism in foreign language teacher training.

The authors report some good news in that we now have a number of models for the effective training of apprentices. The report states (p.3), "As interest in teacher training has increasingly grown over the past few years, there have been a number of significant efforts at several campuses to combine the resources of related departments to enrich teaching apprentice activities." The report includes 18 selected program descriptions, and I confess my pleasure at the inclusion of

Cornell's Summer Training Program for Graduate Assistants in Modern Foreign Languages.

About 1,000 of the more than 2,300 respondents surveyed by the MLA reported involvement in some sort of apprentice teaching activities. (It should be noted that departments of English are included in this statistic.) The authors selected some 400 programs which appeared to provide formal training for a detailed follow-up questionnaire. The report is based on an analysis made in the winter of 1979-80 of those who replied to the second questionaire (54%).

I am particularly gratified to learn (p. 14) that "The practice of greeting a newly arrived graduate student with a textbook and room assignment seems to have (almost) disappeared. Pre-teaching training, though of varying quality and intensity, is now widely available." An informal check of 51 departments in 1966 (as reported in the Modern Language Journal, "Guidelines for Teacher Education Programs in Modern Foreign Languages" (p.80), revealed that almost 60% gave no training in teaching for their assistants.

An even more encouraging note is sounded concerning the professional status of program coordinators (p. 24):

> Our survey found convincing evidence of a major trend in the supervision of teaching apprentice programs in language and literature.... As pointed out [in earlier studies], persons in charge of teaching apprentice operations have usually been the least established members of the staff -- generally untenured, sometimes even without the Ph.D. In recent years, however, there appears to have been in the profession as a whole a significant change in the thinking behind the assignment of teaching apprentice coordinators. Close to two-thirds of the departments participating in our second survey reported that fully tenured faculty members were in charge of supervising apprentices -- many of them distinguished and widely known members of the profession.

But there is bad news as well. As stated in the "Polemical Conclusions and Recommendations" portion of the report just cited (p. 26 ff.), employment opportunities are shrinking just at the moment when greater professional preparation is becoming available. Graduate apprentices are often trained with no other motive than to provide an inexpensive solution

to staffing basic courses. This practice naturally reduces the number of openings for our trained professionals and creates a morale problem which must be addressed by any long-term response. Even excellent training programs are viewed as isolated enterprises in many departments. This can produce a lack of perceived relevance on the part of graduate students between their studies and their teaching. If these problems persist even where training is available, one wonders what the educational experience is like where language instructors have no preparation whatsoever for teaching.

I am also disturbed by a point which I hesitate to put plainly but which I feel obliged to mention nonetheless. Why is it that provisions for teacher training are viewed as an extraordinary rather than routine activity in our profession? Certainly it is difficult to explain to our students or to the public at large why professional training for future language teachers is not required as a matter of course. The MLA and similar organizations are solidly in favor of such training; our faculties and graduate students are likewise convinced of its worth; indeed, there appears to be no one willing to be quoted who is against it. I suspect some dark and powerful forces are at work, and this warrants a brief digression.

Institutional Black Holes

I have been stimulated by recent theoretical developments in astronomy. The concept of a black hole in space is particularly awe-inspiring: a concentration of mass so dense that its gravitational field sweeps up all matter and energy in its vicinity and does not allow even light to escape. I have come to the melancholy conclusion that large institutions are capable, even destined, to generate a similar phenomenon unless extraordinary countermeasures are taken. Institutions of education are dedicated to the giving out of light; but the powerful forces of economics and the dark issues of educational priorities can combine to defeat this commitment. Clear issues become obscure, and our energies begin to be absorbed by activities which substitute for effective action.

A prime example of such an activity, as you may have already guessed, is the dreaded faculty committee. Under the right conditions, vast amounts of energy, good will, intelligence, and even money can be invested in a report which produces no discernible impact on our educational universe. It is particularly ironic that an institution devoted to enlightenment can produce a kind of sink-hole for good ideas. My training in linguistics has led me to investigate carefully

the wording of these institutional studies for clues to the origin of their black hole effect. Take for example, the implementation section of any recommendation for the improvement of language teacher training. There is cause for concern if one finds, instead of a budget line, a sudden increase in agentless passive constructions.

You probably have some knowledge of what life in a black hole committee is like. It is impossible to find anyone who opposes your recommendations, thus there is no one to confront. You may even find, as happened to me while serving with a group devoted to making recommendations for the improvement of undergraduate education, that a similar committee had drawn up nearly identical conclusions some 14 years ago. Needless to say, the sense of futility in the enterprise can be wonderfully depressing.

A psychologist colleague advises that the surest way to produce neurotic anxiety of the paralyzing sort is to assign responsibility without power. Perhaps it is a sense of powerlessness which lies at the heart of our difficulty in providing effective teacher training for all our future professionals. In the event that this is true, I would like to conclude my digression on black holes with a personal conclusion. If an educational problem has been well-analyzed, and its solution turns out to be rather straightforward, it is senseless to participate in activities which substitute for the accomplishment of meaningful reform. There are moments when one must say that the time for committees is over. Budgets must be provided for essential functions; administrations must be educated as to priorities. Academics must get in the habit of assuming personal responsibility for teacher training -- it simply does not suffice to say that we have understood the problem and that it is up to someone else to solve it.

The Events of Change

I will presume to give a rather personal account of the events which I think should take place in the establishment of a training program for language teaching assistants. Despite some appearances to the contrary, I hasten to make it clear that I do not consider Cornell's training program exemplary, but I do consider it an adequate minimal preparation for teaching duties. Its main features may be summarized briefly. A six-week pre-service training program is offered during the summer for those without previous training or experience. It features classroom observation and practice teaching under the guidance of an experienced instructor, workshops on methodology,

and lectures on applied linguistics and language acquisition. In-service training is provided through courses in the applied linguistics of the commonly taught languages, as well as through weekly meetings with course heads, who visit classes and provide a critique of teaching effectiveness. The program is a cooperative enterprise of broad scope which requires the good will and support of one's colleagues. As will become clear, I do not wish to give the impression that significant change is likely to take place in a vacuum.

Event I - Attitude

Event I may be called a change in attitude. Good teaching is obviously desirable for practical reasons, a point granted by all. But few seem to grant that good teaching is an interesting and complex enterprise which requires knowledge beyond that of the particular subject being taught. An understanding of the academic aspects of teacher training is, in my opinion, a vital prerequisite to bringing about a significant change in professional priorities. It is essentially an armchair event. That is, a certain amount of education has to take place before one's colleagues are convinced that learning the profession of teaching presents challenges on an academic par with the traditional subject matter specialties.

As one seeks to clarify what it is that one's teaching assistants should know, one realizes that the scope of expertise demanded by excellence in foreign language instruction is enormous. Taking for granted the practical command of the target language and familiarity with its cultural setting, we ask our instructors to control a great deal of linguistics, especially in the subfields of psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics. We expect a knowledge and appreciation of the literary forms of the language, which entails an understanding of political and historical events. The duties assigned imply a thorough understanding of the best thinking in the field of education (especially with regard to the students' aptitude and motivation) as well as familiarity with the general principles of the psychology of learning. As succinctly stated in the MLA report cited previously (p. 31), "The phenomenon of learning has been studied intensively in our time and the results cannot be ignored by those who are themselves learning to teach."

Thanks to our colleagues in education and psychology, as well as in literature and linguistics, one has access to readable and intelligent studies which speak directly to the very practical problems faced by the language teacher in the

classroom. There is simply no need for us to learn this business totally through a trial-and-error approach. Good teaching rests on solid principles which meet anyone's test of academic rigor. A lack of understanding and application of these principles amounts to an appalling failure to exploit the academic resources available on the subject of language learning.

Event II - Objectives Analysis

Foreign language learning entails an enormous investment of time for significant achievement, as the skill components are complex and rich in detailed subleties. We are thus necessarily required to think in terms of language programs, involving a graded instructional sequence. It is in such a learning environment that one must take great care to insure that instruction serves objectives which are carefully considered and shared by student and teacher alike. The teacher who lacks a thorough understanding of his goals can neither focus the student on productive activities nor promote meaningful learning.

Event II, then, consists of a painstaking assessment (or reassessment) of the objectives of each component of a language program. I consider this objectives analysis to be an absolutely essential prelude to the establishment of a teacher training program; without an intelligent framework in which to exercise one's skills, expertise becomes meaningless. This event may be seen as involving two interdependent operations.

First, it is useful to have certain kinds of evaluation of one's existing program. Student evaluations are excellent sources of information on how well instructional objectives are understood and on how well students with diverse language learning aptitude and motivation are being served. Peer evaluation, including that provided from sources outside of one's own educational establishment, can provide a valuable assessment of the effectiveness of teaching techniques being used and suggest areas of improvement in materials and curriculum design.

Secondly, the program designer must be satisfied that appropriate materials and efficient methodology are being employed to achieve the stated goals of instruction. This means that the testing program must be capable of informing both instructor and student of progress toward objectives. It is pointless, in my opinion, to discuss the worth of a particular methodology in the absence of an agreement on objectives and testing.

Event III - Implementation

The final event will have to do with the actual implementation of a teacher training program. It has been my experience that one is ill-advised to begin this phase unless events I and II have taken place. Event I, a change in attitude, will be required to muster adequate support for teacher training. A large part of the organizer's activities will be devoted to educating others concerning both the necessity for training and the scope of the program. Event II, an analysis of objectives, will be required to design an intelligent program which members of the educational establishment will be willing to support or participate in. At this point, one is in need of a strategy for actually getting a training program started.

It has been my experience that a teacher training program in the theory and practice of language teaching can fail if the participants cannot relate the instruction to their immediate concerns in the classroom. Thus I recommend a "grass roots" approach, conceived by an experienced teacher for the perceived needs within a department. The trainees, especially if they view themselves as future professionals, are valuable consultants for designing the program of instruction. The supervisor, of course, must still accept responsibility for providing an informed synthesis of all concerns for the training program. The supervisors, in turn, should expect and receive the support of his or her department, the members of which have been educated as to the value of the enterprise. The department must provide professional recognition for the supervisor's efforts and be active in seeking funding within the educational establishment. Any teacher training which begins by meeting real needs at the departmental level and ends by earning institutional support may be considered to have effected a significant reform.

Detailed designs for teacher training programs are already available in print, so I will limit the following commentary to some thoughts on the objectives of teacher training. One may elect to train teachers solely for duties within a given course assignment. This kind of training will naturally include instruction on how to use the techniques of the methodology selected, how to create lesson plans for the materials used, and how to design tests and evaluate the results. The apprentice is viewed as a kind of para-professional whose effectiveness depends greatly on the skill and guidance of a supervisor or course head. The question remains, however, who trains the the supervisor?

Most language teaching supervisors today, if my impression is correct, did not have an opportunity for formal training in language pedagogy. Even the best admit to a sometimes painful trial-and-error period while the necessary experience and expertise were gained. This situation could be at least in part remedied by simply enlarging the scope of training provided for our apprentices. These trainees provide the pool from which future professional language teachers will emerge. Since it is common practice for newly appointed assistant professors to assume immediately a role as language supervisor, it follows that their apprenticeship should be addressed to a dual concern: mastery of techniques required in the immediate context of a particular course assignment and a broad understanding of the larger concerns to be faced when designing a course for a particular program.

I can see many benefits from an approach to teacher training which combines theory and practice in the way described. Short-term benefits are seen in apprentices who use techniques in a context of understanding of program objectives. They tend to be more creative and resourceful in the classroom and do a better job of transmitting the purpose of the drill component of language teaching. Long-term benefits may be expected to derive from a teaching experience in which the apprentice has been alerted to look for and observe the developmental aspects of language acquisition. These observations will eventually be the basis for the improvement of our understanding of sound language instruction principles. The objective is to prepare an apprentice for eventual professional activity as a supervisor who is well-informed, flexible, and resourceful in providing efficient solutions in varying educational contexts.

Conclusion

I have argued that there is a reasonably good understanding in our profession of how to achieve effective teacher training and even a great deal of good will toward providing it. What is lacking is a sense of personal commitment on the part of those who are capable of bringing about the change which they desire. I do not underestimate the forces which resist change -- the great inertia of the status quo does indeed bring about a sense of powerlessness. Even so, one is uncomfortable with the feeling that self-fulfilling prophecies often begin with a statement of what can't be done.

If we ask whose move it is to bring about foreign language teacher training, do we need someone else to remind us that we are the only ones capable of providing the necessary expertise?

CONFLICTING PARADIGMS IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION: RETHINKING INNOVATION

A. Ronald Walton

Introduction(1)

I should like to begin by thanking The Wilson Center for providing this unique forum. I would also like to note that while the focus here today is quite properly on the field of East Asian languages, I hope that this forum and others like it in the future will have some impact on the entire field of foreign language study in higher education. I say this because, as I suggest in my discussion today, I feel quite strongly that the problems which we confront in the East Asian language field are, in fact, problems common to language teaching and learning in colleges and universities throughout the United States.

It is quite natural that this conference consider the topic of innovation for there can be no doubt that innovative approaches have a potentially significant role in setting new priorities for the teaching and learning of East Asian languages. I say "potentially significant" because while innovation can contribute, it can also detract. All too often there seems to be the assumption that new is automatically good and therefore worth pursuing and the assumption that language learning -- a complex, demanding, time-consuming process -- will be miraculously simplified by some ultimate breakthrough.

Meanwhile, back in the "real world," we find that innovations have a way of sweeping through foreign language education in much the same way that fad diets sweep through the best-seller list -- here today, gone tomorrow. Of course, the ultimate breakthrough remains as elusive as ever.

Thus, I suppose that in a typical discussion of innovation, one is expected to single out those innovations that seem most promising and then offer suggestions on how they are to be implemented. In this sense, my approach to the topic today will be quite atypical. The description and implementation of innovative approaches makes little sense without well-defined criteria for evaluation, and, in my opinion, the language teaching field, including the East Asian field, has continually failed to establish such criteria.

Therefore, rather than dwelling on specific innovations, a short-range approach unlikely to yield lasting results, I propose instead to examine critically the role of innovation in the field: What are we getting? What is it doing for us? Are we getting what we need? Do we even know what we need?

One way to look at foreign language education is in terms of strategy and tactics.(2) Strategy is concerned with goals or objectives, tactics with how one goes about reaching those

goals. Tactics are meaningless without strategies: we can't figure out "how-to-do-it" (tactics), unless we have some clear idea of "what-we-are-trying-to do"(strategy).

By the same token, innovation can be classified as strategic (that is, the formulation of new goals) or as tactical (the formulation of new ways to go about reaching established goals).

The gist of my remarks today is that we foreign language educators have too often confused strategy with tactics and that we all too frequently tend to rely on tactical solutions -- new methodologies, new textual materials, new testing techniques, new approaches to teacher training, etc. -- to solve what are essentially problems of strategy or goals.

Paradigms in Conflict

Let me begin by asking whether or not the field of foreign language education is indeed afflicted with problems of strategy. I believe that it is, not because there are no goals but rather because there are too many. These goals are normally covert and are embedded in what I shall term "paradigms." Some paradigms directly involved in the language teaching field are the Literature Paradigm, the Research Paradigm, the Area Studies/ Culture Paradigm, the Linguistics Paradigm and the Native Teaching Paradigm. Some representative tangent paradigms are the Psycholinguistic/Applied Linguistics Paradigm, the TESL Paradigm, the General Education Paradigm, and fnally the "Better Over There" Paradigm. In one way or another, each of these paradigms makes some claim on what language teaching and learning is all about. Yet, as I shall try to demonstrate, no one paradigm can claim full legitimacy.

The Literature Paradigm, though often involved in basic language training, posits as its ultimate goal the study of literature. The leadership consists of literature specialists, and the paradigm is evident in an almost exclusive concentration on literature, beginning as early as the second year of language study.

Critics contend that, among other things, literature is by no means a natural extension of basic language study an] that this paradigm tends to overemphasize grammar, reading, translation and composition. They say that literature is a poor choice even for building reading skills, since it is stylistically marked and unconstrained in vocabulary. They further insist that this paradigm requires skills in literary

appreciation and literary criticism seldom possessed by educated native speakers of the target language and that familiarity with the target culture through literature can be transmitted more efficiently in the early stages of language study by reading English translations.

The Research Paradigm focuses on training potential scholars to handle primary materials in the target language. Its leadership normally consists of discipline specialists who have studied the target language and who often have definite opinions, based on their own experience, as to how best to study and teach the language.

Critics contend that, among other things, this paradigm is generally unsuitable for undergraduates because it tends to emphasize the written word to the exclusion of the spoken word. They feel that this paradigm actually leads to decoding rather than reading, and premature exposure to decoding actually inhibits the later development of reading fluency. They claim that students in this paradigm are doomed to literal interpretation and translation unless they can read "between the lines," but note that in order to read "between the lines," one needs first-hand experience in the target culture. This in turn requires the very oral skills this paradigm tends to de-emphasize. They further claim that as a rsult of this paradigm many scholars often require the painstaking acquisition of oral skills later in their careers. Finally, they argue that discipline specialists are not qualified to make judgments on language teaching and learning just because they have previously studied the language.

The Area Studies/Culture Paradigm properly points out that language cannot be studied without reference to the target culture. Proponents hold that the goal of cultural awareness and familiarity is just as valid as the mastery of language, and they insist that culture should be directly included in the language teaching/learning curriculum.

Critics contend that, among other things, culture belongs in the language classroom only at those points where culture touches language -- verbal and communication behavior. Language teachers, they maintain, already have their hands full teaching language. They claim that language teachers are no more qualified to teach "culture," with all its complexities, than are culture specialists qualified to teach language, with its own complexities, and that culture, aside from ethnocommunication, is most efficiently taught in English by area and discipline specialists.

Adherents to the Linguistics Paradigm hold that since linguistics provides scientific descriptions of the language, linguists should be responsible for teaching the sound system, grammar and lexicon of the target language.

Critics argue that language analysis is quite distinct from language teaching and learning -- skills that are more properly grounded in psychology and learning theory. They point out that linguistics, including sociolinguistics and ethnolinguistics, while providing valuable insights, is a rather theoretical discipline which does not have, and, indeed, often claims openly not to have, direct application to language pedagogy. Also they claim that linguists in the language classroom often tend to overemphasize the formal structure of language rather than the active use of this structure by adult second-language learners.

The Native Language Paradigm of each culture, I suggest, defines "language" in a culturally determined way and quite naturally and unconsciously encourages native speakers to teach their language in much the same manner in which it was formally acquired by them, thus giving rise to the Native Teaching Paradigm.

The Native Teaching Paradigm is most readily seen in native-run language programs designed for foreigners and conducted within the country of the particular language and in native-run programs designed to teach foreign languages to other native-speaking members of the culture. Modified versions of this paradigm tend to carry over when native speakers teach their language abroad.

Proponents of this paradigm properly maintain that native speakers are the ultimate authorities of their own language's usage and that there is no substitute, either linguistically or culturally, for native-speaking teachers.

Among other things, critics contend that the ability to speak a language, even natively, does not imply the ability to teach it. They point out that native speakers, having neither the experience of learning their own language as a foreign language nor the experience of participating in their own culture as a foreigner, cannot really understand nor empathize with the language learning and communication problems encountered by non-natives. They further argue that native speakers of any culture tend to teach from their own <u>formal</u> learning experience, which rarely includes the classroom study of <u>speech</u>. They therefore tend to overemphasize the written medium -- the medium in which they themselves received formal

instruction. Finally, they claim that many native speakers tend to teach varieties, registers, and styles that have been unnecessarily and even misleadingly censored and filtered for foreign consumption.

Other educational paradigms speak indirectly to the question of what foreign language study is, or should be, about.

The pedagogical arm of the Psycholinguistic Paradigm makes the legitimate claim that language pedagogy, rather than theoretical linguistics, should be the focus of language teaching and learning.

Critics counter that this paradigm often fails to distinguish consistently between first and second language acquisition and that research within this paradigm is rather strongly oriented towards English and is most closely aligned with the teaching of English. They protest that this paradigm has contributed little to the specific problems of the less commonly taught languages, such as, for example, the psycholinguistic problems inherent in the reading of non-alphabetic languages by native alphabetic readers or the psycholinguistic problems involved in learning a tone language.

Finally, they say in the teaching of the less commonly taught languages the step from psycholinguistic theory to practice will prove insurmountable until there are psycholinguists who actually speak these languages.

Some language educators hold that foreign language teaching has much to learn from the TESL Paradigm, due to its concern with, and experience in, methodological approaches, text preparation, testing and the like.

However, its critics respond that this paradigm provides a poor model for the teaching of foreign languages because it often assumes a prior familiarity with the written medium, as evidenced by the widespread screening of students through the TOEFL exam and by the fact that textbooks designed to teach the foreign language, English, are written in English. They also protest that, because of its linguistically varied audience, the TESL Paradigm does not make use of the comparative and contrastive approaches which have proven their utility in the teaching of the less commonly taught languages.

The General Education Paradigm, often put forward as a justification for the language requirement, holds that language learning in and of itself is an important part of a college education, that the value of foreign language study goes beyond

the tangibles of language use into the realm of sharpening the mind, better understanding of one's own language and culture, and so on.

Lambert (1981) has rcently summarized the criticisms against this paradigm, but the most damning critics are students themselves, who simply don't buy it.

Finally, the "Better Over There" Paradigm, popular in this country, maintains that formal language study in an institutional setting is a waste of time and that "picking a language up" is easier and more fun than formally "learning" it.

Let me criticize this paradigm with an analogy. One does not jump into the middle of a professional game to learn how to play basketball. The participants are not there to teach but to play ball. One must be trained in the basic skills of dribbling, passing, jump shots, free-throws; one must memorize plays; one must know the rules; one must be trained by a coach. Aside from the exceptionally gifted. the same sequence of systematic skill acquisition and guided training is required for introductory language learning.

Now I am not claiming that these paradigms exists as such, that there are actually proponents actively making such claims, or that the critics are actually so vocal -- many of the criticisms are my own. But while I readily admit to having painted with a rather broad brush, I do feel that the notion of paradigms does provide a way for exposing hidden pitfalls in language education, and I do think that there is at least some validity in this analysis.

Nevertheless, some might claim that even if this portrait is accurate, it is not alarming here: since there are many purposes for undertaking language study, these paradigms simply represent a healthy diversity of goals. With respect to basic language training, I strongly disagree with this view. If such a diversity of goals truly exists, and if each is valid then we are plunged into a paralyzing relativity where anything goes. Rather than a healthy diversity, I see these paradigms as pulling us in so many different and conflicting directions that the result is mere confusion.

Language teachers these days are increasingly confronted on the one side by students demanding practical conversational and communication skills and on the other by demands to prepare students for literature and research. Teachers. already overtaxed, are made to feel guilty if they are not scholars, culture specialists, linguists or psycholinguists. Native-speaking teachers are made to feel incomplete because they are

"only" native speakers. There is no question that the field needs to develop standards of professionalism through vigorous teacher training. But what exactly should language teachers be trained to do? Are they to provide basic language training for literature specialists, future research scholars, pragmatically inclined, professionally-oriented undergraduates? Are they to be linguists, psycholinguists, culture specialists, psychotherapists (as some current teaching approaches imply)? If, as often seems to be the case, they are to be and to do all of the above, then I am afraid we have overextended our expectations of what is humanly possible for a classroom teacher.

More importantly, who shall train these teachers -- the theoretical linguists, the discipline and area specialists, the psycho- and applied linguists who often don't even speak the target language or understand the problems inherent in teaching the language? The upshot of this situation, I fear, is a perplexed and often demoralized profession.

Textbooks cannot possibly fulfill all these paradigms, so textual materials are constantly criticized as being too linguistic or not linguistic enough, too literary or not literary enough, too colloquial or not authentic enough, as having too much vocabulary, not enough vocabulary, the "right" vocabulary, excessive emphasis on pedagogy or not enough, and so on.

Native-speaking teachers, operating quite naturally under the influence of the Native Language Paradigm, often see their language, the teaching of it, and their materials in quite a different light from non-native textbook writers who attempt to present the target language to fellow non-natives. I believe that it is fair to say that not a few native-speaking teachers -- especially those who are less experienced in teaching foreigners -- are deeply suspicious of text materials written by non-natives and strongly prefer textbooks conforming to the Native Language Paradigm.

The near-obsessional fervor with which textbooks are modified, adapted and supplemented, not just by native-speaking teachers attempting to realign the materials with the Native Language paradigm but also by adherents to the other paradigms as well, attests to the confusion surrounding the proper goals of a textbook for foreigners. Recall here that I am not speaking of the adaptation and revision of advanced materials for specific audiences but of basic materials at the introductory level.

We are often told that standardized tests using sophisticated testing instruments, such as the cloze procedure and oral proficiency exams, will privide a coherent set of goals for the field. But it would be impossible to design standard tests that would please all these paradigms. Even if such tests were developed, each paradigm could reject the test on the grounds that it does not fit that paradigm's goals. Who will design these tests, as representatives of the various paradigms exert their qualifications and special interests?

Project proposals, national committees, the management of overseas language programs, and the like, are all dependent on the advice and participation of so-called "language experts," but there is much confusion as to who the experts are. Are they theoretical linguists, literature specialists, native-speaking teachers, historians, economists, political scientists? Thus, the acquisition and allocation of outside resources, the direction of the field, and the very future of the field is constantly at the mercy of these various paradigms which inevitably see foreign language education in divergent and even contradictory ways.

I could go on here, but even at this point, as we gaze over the field of basic foreign language education, two haunting questions arise, at least in my mind: Who's in charge here? Of what?

Tactical Innovation to the Rescue?

By now you may be asking what has all this to do with innovation? Just this: given the labyrinth I have just described, we find the widespread notion that we can innovate our way out -- giving rise to my belief that frustration is often the mother of innovation. But if I am correct, rather than turning to strategic innovations to resolve strategic problems, we have been turning instead to tactical innovations such as new methodologies, new text materials, new media and the like. I have said earlier, however, that tactics are meaningless without strategies, and I have just argued that, in my opinion, we are in a strategic mess. Let me now move on to examine some tactical innovations and try to demonstrate that they are often prescribed in vain.

From the discussion above, it would appear that tactical innovations such as teacher-training, the development of improved textual materials and the development and implementation of new testing techniques all presuppose a set of coherent goals which do not yet exist and assume the particpation

of language experts whose qualifications we seem unable to agree upon. But what about methodology?

Methodology deserves a rather special and more lengthy treatment, not because it is the most important type of tactical innovation, but because it is so often regarded as a panacea of curing language teaching/learning problems, and especially because it receives so much attention both within the profession and in the mass media.

There are any number of ways to characterize the nature of methodology, but I find it useful to employ two basic dichotomies: namely Fact versus Act and Set versus Setting. FACT refers to the formal study of the rules and conventions of language, what students and teachers often refer to as "grammar." ACT refers to physical performance -- speaking and comprehending the language. On the simplest level, Act simply refers to overcoming obstacles to communication in the language. A higher level of Act demands skill acquisition -- not just communicating but communicating with fluency, accuracy, and automaticity. The highest level of Act refers to cross-cultural speech acts, the appropriate use of the language in <u>intercultural</u> communication.

Turning to the Set-Setting dichotomy, SETTING refers to the teaching/learning environment: teachers, texts, methodologies, evaluation, the classroom, the language laboratory, and the like. SET, on the other hand, describes what the learner brings to this environment. Set can be divided into the learner's Cognitive Set -- age, aptitude, past-learning experience, modality preferences, etc. -- and the learner's Emotive Set -- personality, motivation, self-image, and attitudes toward foreign language study, toward the Setting itself and so on.

If we apply this framework to what I perceive to be the current trend in methodological innovation, characterized by such approaches as Total Physical Response, Community Language Learning, the Silent Way, and Suggestopedia among others, I believe the following picture emerges. First, this trend seems focused on the Act side of learning and determined to minimize the Fact side, that side concerned with explicit grammatical explanation. At the same time, this trend appears to be deeply concerned with the learner's Emotive Set. Current approaches heavily stress "self" -- self-image, self-protection, self-awareness, self-projection, self-motivation, self-initiative, self-confidence, and so forth.

The emphasis on Act and the Emotive Set have led in turn to emphases on induction, self-generated mastery of language skills, and to an avoidance of teacher-centered training. Correction, repetition, externally imposed standards of performance, are minimized so that induction is unhampered and the learner's Emotive Set is protected.

One can certainly understand the trend away from Fact towards Act characteristic of these new approaches. A fair number of the paradigms which I mentioned earlier have tended to stress grammar-based teaching, reading and writing so heavily that students have accurately pleaded inability to speak a language after years of study. One can likewise applaud the sincere concern with the learner's Emotive Set as a long overdue antidote to earlier behavioristic attitudes toward language learners. Yet, there are those among us involved in foreign language education who find the general drift of such current trends somewhat questionable.

We seem to find here methodologies drawing heavily on first language acquisition, despite claims to the contrary and despite warnings from scholars involved in research on adult second-language acquisition. We would like to argue that, while induction is certainly desirable in promoting self-initiative, it may be a rather slow and inefficient model for language acquisition -- as first language acquisition itself shows -- and in fact an inefficient model for the rapid acquisition of any skill.

We would like to propose that a heavily inductive approach to adult second-language acquisition neglects the very strengths that the adult learner brings to the task, especially analytic ability and the ability and discipline to work with visual and audio materials outside the classroom. We would like to suggest that perhaps the mastery of the Fact dimension is not totally illegitimate. Although we have indeed mismanaged it, we should find better ways of integrating it with Act, rather than reject or minimize it.

We could make a case that language skill mastery, that level of Act above just "speaking in the language," is not really so different from the mastery of any skill. Skill acquisition seems always to involve motor memory, which in return requires rehearsal, repetitive practice to some degree, and rather precise and frequent feedback which is so necessary to achieve purely physical accuracy and fluency.

While one can certainly appreciate that these approaches are geared toward real communication rather than the sterile

mouthing of canned material, we would like to argue that the highest level of Act is aimed at speech acts between members of different cultures. Communication among the members of a class, speaking to one another, even with the guidance of a native speaker, or communication based on the manipulation of rods, or on the learner's reaction to commands, or on knowing thousands of words, is quite different from, and falls quite short of, the communicative needs of the student who must function in the target culture. This latter type of communication is not based on what one wants to say, but rather on what is appropriate to say. Intercultural communication is constrained by conventions inherent in the target culture, which take into account the age, sex, and social position of the speaker and addressee, the degree of familiarity between the participants, the degree of formality or informality of the speech setting, the appropriateness of certain topics, the pragmatics of disagreement, encouragement, evasiveness, etc.

These conventions are complex, but they must be mastered. Conventional approaches and textbooks, complete with situationally-based speech acts, identification of speaker and addressee, etc. have provided -- through samples of native speech -- a guide to such conventions. Yet, it is unclear how such communicative features are to be mastered in self-initiated, non-text, non-teacher-centered learning environments. No one is eager to rob students of self-initiative by imposing outside models upon them, and yet the target culture itself does impose such constraints, and effective intercultural communication presupposes that these constraints have been internalized. To those who would argue that speech should be mastered first, thus paving the way for later training in intercultural communication, we would like to say that one cannot separate speech and communication -- as any student of Japanese learns the first day of class. Further such an artificial separation, if it were possible, would be quite inefficient and quite misleading as well. We could argue that methodologies designed to ease the fear of speaking should not turn into breeding grounds for students who have not been prepared for, and thus may come to fear, intercultural communication.

I have repeatedly said here that some of us would like to argue that language learning requires such and such and that these current approaches do not meet the requirements; but in fact, we really cannot predicate our arguments on what "language learning" requires, because there is no clear idea in the strategic domain, with all its conflicting paradigms, as to what language learning is or should be. Given the diversity and relativity of goals, there is simply no coherent, systematic, well-defined way to evaluate the efficacy of a

given tactical innovation. What we often hear of such innovative approaches is that, despite criticisms, they actually do "work." And, of course they do: every approach "works" so long as there is no definition of what "works" really means.

There is certainly one criticism that I would like to offer against both the current trend and the traditional, conventional approaches as well. Namely, that we in foreign language education seem to have developed the rather narrow view that learners have a pristine Set as regards language study and that this Set is carved in stone. We then proceed to invent increasingly more sophisticated ways to penetrate and tap this Set by modifying the Setting -- new textual formats, new teaching approaches, creative use of video and computers, and so on. One could argue that the field has indeed become more sophisticated, but we are applying 1980s approaches to a Model-T language learner. In other words, the language teaching field has rather dramatically failed to create the sophisticated language learner.

These current methodologies provide an excellent illustration of the attitude that learners can be taught language in spite of their lack of knowledge about language and about language learning. Such approaches are indeed sensitive to the learner's Set, but they cater to it rather than try to adjust or modify it. Have we rejected the cognitive conditioning, characteristic of stimulus-response behavioristic teaching models, only to replace it with guided induction via stimulus-response emotive conditioning?

One could argue that perhaps our students fear language learning not because they are emotively fragile, but because they are being asked to perform a demanding task which they understand poorly and which they are ill prepared to undertake. One could propose that the longer we continue to condition the learner, rather than educating him about language study, the larger the gap between language teaching and language learning will become. It could be argued that perhaps it is time to begin restructuring the learner, rather than constantly restructuring the teaching/learning environment; time to try to modify the learner's Set and adapt it to the Setting rather than the other way around; time for language teachers to stop flagellating themselves for not being able to do everything and shift some of the burden of language mastery to the learner -- not the Model-T learner of today -- but the sophisticated learner we have yet to produce.

It is interesting to note that the thrust of so many recent commission and task-force reports on the crisis in foreign language learning dwells heavily on even more restructuring of the Setting, especially with respect to improving cultural awareness, when it seems so obvious that no small element of this crisis is the abysmal absence of the educated language consumer. Further revamping of the Setting will not erase the naivete of language consumers who plan to become fluent in six weeks, who think that language mastery is built around knowing words, who disparage of formal study and would prefer to "pick it up" "over there," who are willing subjects for any learning methodology that is new, effortless and painless.

Educating students and the American public at large about what foreign language mastery requires, what intercultural communication involves, what sorts of study procedures and techniques are useful -- this would be an innovation of enormous dimensions and one that should rightfully emanate from the academic community with its teaching experience and research capabilities. But even here we come back to the same old problem: How can we educate the American language consumer about "language learning" when this term, this phenomenon, means so many different things to so many different practitioners, working within so many different paradigms?

In concluding this discussion of tactical innovation, let me hasten to point out that I am not attempting to denigrate such innovation. There will always be the need for such innovative approaches, and each approach stands to make some contribution to the improvement of language study. I am only suggesting that in and of themselves, without guiding strategies and without clearly established goals, such innovations defy meaningful evaluation and cannot possibly be expected to work the wonders we so often and so readily expect from them.

Strategic Innovations

Since I have suggested that strategic problems cannot be resolved by tactical innovations, I feel obligated to propose some plausible strategic innovations. Each of the paradigms discussed earlier, save the "Better-Over-There" Paradigm, has much to offer in terms of resources and expertise. The sorts of strategic innovations necessary to tap these resources and this expertise must address at least four basic issues: 1) the logistical problem of structuring a coherent language study curriculum; 2) an agreement on realistic expectations as

to how much learners can master in the college and university setting; 3) a careful assessment of which specific skills learners need, a more precise definition of such skills and careful attention to the skill-mix; and 4) agreement on the qualifications and responsibilities of those charged with the management of basic language training.

As to the logistical problem of structuring a coherent language study program, it seems obvious that we need to forge the conflicting paradigms into a cooperative, overreaching framework which I shall term the "Foreign Language Education Paradigm." I see this paradigm as composed of two complementary programs: a Language Learning Program, followed by and distinct from a Language Utilization Program.[3]

The Language Learning Program is just that -- a program geared to language learning, not literature, not research, not area studies, not culture (except where culture touches language and communication), and not linguistics as such. Study of these latter topics lies either in the Language Utilization Program or in discipline courses taught by the appropriate specialists.

The Language Utilization Program takes the graduate of the Language Learning Program and focuses on the area of that student's particular interest -- literature, area disciplines, training in research skills in the target language, and so forth. One could argue that not all students in the Language Learning Program will necessarily go on to the Language Utilization Program within the educational setting. Here we must recognize the thrust of the General Education Paradigm -- though not its emphasis on "intangibles": the role of this program is to train the student in a skill commensurate with the goals of a college education. We do not teach freshman composition in English expecting that all students will become English majors or that students should be able to write a novel by their senior year. Particularly with respect to the less commonly taught languages, such basic training is esentially available only in the university or college setting.

Likewise, not all students emerging from the Language Learning Program -- a program which I suggest should require a minimum of two years -- will necessarily have an area of specific interest as they move up to the Language Utilization Program. Thus, this latter program must be prepared to teach advanced conversational and written medium skills of a more general sort and, ideally, to teach these skills in the target language in courses conducted by native-speaking teachers. Assuming that students primarily interested in specific

disciplines such as literature, history, political science, and the like have access to special language courses taught by discipline specialists, it could be argued that the focus of the written medium in the more general advanced courses should be on the reading of expository prose -- that type of prose found in popular magazines, news magazines, and certain portions of newspapers. This prose style tends to be more formulaic and less characterized by the idiosyncracies of an individual writer's style (as is the case with literature), and while the vocabulary pool is admittedly large, it does tend to be more constrained and more useful in the oral domain than does the rather unconstrained and often quite literary vocabulary characteristic of fiction. It should also be pointed out that the ability to read this type of prose, these sorts of materials, will be useful to all students, regardless of academic specialization, who plan to reside in the target culture or who wish to become more familiar with the popular, everyday culture of a given language area through primary language materials.

For those students moving into a specialized curriculum within the Language Utilization Program, there will likely be a transition area where the language teaching specialists and the discipline specialists work together in the same course. Such schemes have recently been put forward by Jorden (1981) and Lambert (1981). One possible innovation here is to pool the expertise and resources within the Language Utilization sphere by offering intensive summer programs -- not just in general language training as is now the case, but in advanced language courses geared specifically to discipline areas such as literature, history, economics, political science, anthropology, medicine, business, law, and the like. Such a pooling and concentration of specialized language courses would be particularly useful, I believe, in the Asian language field, where no one institution is likely to have the specialists nor the enrollments to offer a full range of such language utilization courses.

In summary, the relationship between the Language Learning and Language Utilization programs can be stated as follows: students are first educated <u>in</u> language so that they may later <u>use</u> language to educate themselves further. Thus, for example, one does not use literature to teach language -- that is a bit like putting the horse before the cart. Rather, one teaches language so that students can then begin the study of literature or any other discipline.

In addition to some sort of structural rearrangement as this, it also seems clear that we need to readjust our expectations of just how much the Language Learning Program, the

lower level program, can realistically accomplish in the college learning environment. An innovation here would be to do less but do it better -- that is, to emphasize quality over quantity. How many staff meetings begin each year with a discussion of how much more must be done this year as compared to last? What is the source of this incessant push for more and more? Obviously, one source is the impatient, often enrollment-hungry language utilization paradigms. But in all fairness, much of the push comes from the language teachers themselves, who feel that they may have the student for only a year or two and therefore must try to cover as much material as possible. Another much more disturbing attitude which I sense in the East Asian language field is that departing students, even those planning to undertake summer study at another institution, are seen as a direct reflection of a particular program's reputation. This covert competitiveness is, however, not necessarily based on quality -- which is rather more difficult to evaluate -- but on quantity: the number of lessons covered and often, in the case of Chinese and Japanese, on the number of characters or kanji covered. There seems to be some sort of agreed upon agenda at work in the field, but nowhere is this agenda and its rationale stated or defended explicitly.

The sad result of this push for "more" is that, as students drop out in forward rush, there are fewer and fewer of them to whom one can teach the more and more. Incidentally, I would take issue with the notion that this approach is desirable because it eliminates the dilletantes, an argument one often hears within the East Asian language field. It is not necessarily true that only the best go on; the best often know, or at least sense, a poorly designed and confused course when they see one and have the intelligence to remove themselves. Unless otherwise stated, we must assume that basic language course are intended for the competent and capable, not only for the truly gifted.

Setting down realistic expectations with respect to basic language training in the Language Learning Program will definitely require innovations in the strategic sphere. Distinguishing the Language Learning Program from the Language Utilization Program will prevent the premature intrusion of the language utilization paradigms (literature, research, etc.) into basic language training -- an intrusion which not only complicates, confuses and diffuses basic teaching, but which may very well discourage and even drive away the very students who, when properly trained and confident, would have eventually pursued such a language utilization curriculum. This distinction between programs should lead to a Language Learning Program

proceeding at a rational pace, rather than at a hectic pace careening towards a plunge into language utilization well before the learner is properly prepared.

However, the use of quality rather than quantity as a yardstick will require other innovations as well. Let us remember the following points: college students normally take four other courses with tests and papers; they often have only two minutes or less of actual performance time in a typical language class hour; they live in an English speaking world outside of class; and language learning is a lifetime undertaking, not simply a four or six-semester task. Accordingly, I suggest that we begin to place tremendous emphasis on teaching students how to teach themselves. This facet of language training is quite in harmony with the goals of higher education, which should be to teach students to think analytically, to master the methodology of a discipline (here the discipline of language acquisition) and to be able to apply this sort of methodological, analytical thinking well after the college years.

The profession's current fascination with teaching methodologies, and with inductive learning methodologies, fails to educate the student in this sense and doubtless contributes to the lowly status accorded to "skill-oriented" language courses as opposed to "substantive" courses. This emphasis on teaching and inductive learning methodologies thus fails to "educate" the student in the broader academic sense and could easily be creating language-learning cripples who become addicted to spoon-feeding and who can only react to external stimuli (including inductively prompted stimuli), instead of creating educated language learners who actually know how to pursue language acquisition based on their knowledge of the subject. The teaching of this conscious knowledge of the "what" and "how" of language acquisition (which I earlier referred to as "restructuring" the learner) cannot be relegated to a two-day orientation; it must actually be built into the curriculum, and this will undoubtedly require a reduction of the emphasis now placed on covering as much material as quickly as possible. Learning how to learn will be useful not only in the later Language Utilization Program but in the target culture as well.

I would defend these innovations geared toward slowing down the headlong rush through material on the grounds that language learning is not a linear progression through material. High quality over less material, with a curriculum designed to teach students how to teach themselves, is likely to produce geometric rates of improvement further up the line. Put another way, the fetish with "covering" material coming from

the teaching side -- including, in the case of East Asian languages, character and kanji cramming--has no necessary correlation with the "mastery" of material on the student's side. Underlying these suggested innovations is a basic assumption -- an assumption which the field often finds difficult to accept -- that language learning requires effort, and especially time, regardless of the premium now put on the quest for cure-all innovative tactical methodologies.

The third of the four strategic issues I claim must be resolved concerns arriving at a workable, coherent definition of the objectives of basic language learning. We need a theory of the objectives complete with explicit hypotheses, and this theory should serve as a beginning point for debate. Such a theory, like my theory, need not be the last word nor need it be "correct," but it should serve to determine the relevant variables, establish a bottom line, and encourage all interested parties within the various paradigms to see the proposed objectives just one way long enough to argue with one another rather than around one another. Notice that I am speaking of a theory of the objectives of language study, not a theory of language learning or language teaching.

Language learning and teaching theories abound and change as research progresses. A theory of the former sort has not, to my knowledge, been proposed, though the various paradigms obviously do have hypotheses which have yet to be articulated and then debated.

Whatever form such an eventual theory of language learning objectives takes, it is likely that the notion of "skill" will figure prominently. I see at least four problems with respect to the concept of skill, and each, I submit, will require innovations of the strategic sort.

As it now stands, the over-reaction to earlier behavioristic models of language learning has caused the emotive side of language acquisition to overshadow the cognitive side. A balanced definition of language learning must readdress the question of whether or not language study requires skill mastery. If it can be argued that skill mastery is indeed critical, then I recommend that we look at skill acquisition outside the language domain and search for "universals" of skill acquisition. Language learning should not be an exception. This should allow us, once and for all, to decide whether induction is an efficient way to acquire a skill, whether skill mastery does or does not require rehearsal, practice, repetition, whether or not motor memory is crucial -- and thus whether or not "memorization" (of the motor memory sort) is valid, whether

or not constant and rigorous feedback via correction is desirable, etc. Should we discover that the cognitive side of skill acquisition is indispensable, then we should make this an explicit component of basic language learning objectives.

A second problem requiring innovation centers on more precise definitions of the various skills. Communicative Competence is often suggested as a fifth skill beyond the usual four. Assuming that one studies the oral medium of a foreign language in order to communicate with members of another culture, I would redefine Communicative Competence as "intercultural Communicative Competence" and include speaking and listening under this skill. This definition would then distinguish communication based on students speaking to one another in the target language, communication based on reacting to commands, communication based on the manipulation of abstract symbols, and so on, from the kind of communication needed to interact with native speakers of a foreign language.

Redefining reading and writing as skills is also problematic, again largely because the conflicting paradigms confuse language learning and language utilization and tend to define these skills in vague and contradictory ways. The skill of reading should at a minimum be distinguished from word (or character) recognition, decoding, translation and textual exegesis. Word recognition is simply a necessary but not sufficient conditon for reading. Decoding refers to that process whereby the learner looks up every other word in a dictionary, writes the word translations in the text (attempting to unravel the meaning of the sentence by a linear linking of the translated words), then consciously analyzes the structure of the sentence, and so forth. Translation and textual exegesis require sophisticated training by experts in these fields; such subjects belong in the Language Utilization Program, not the Language Learning Program.

Reading can at least be defined as none of the above for it implies comprehending passages under time pressure, when there is no opportunity for decoding and translation.

The skill of writing also requires a more precise definition. Writing to promote reading, writing as a check-out on oral structure, and expressive writing or composition are often lumped together without the realization that each of these types of writing serves different purposes, makes use of different cognitive skills and requires different teaching methodologies and evaluation procedures.

This raises the third problem with respect to skill mastery, namely the weight that is to be assigned to each skill based on the student's ultimate needs, not just on what teachers within the various paradigms deem as worthwhile. Here, composition deserves close scrutiny. While arguments can be made in favor of composition at the lower levels, there are those who claim that it is a test of imagination rather than skill and that it forces students to waste time with bilingual dictionaries -- using inappropriate literal equivalents or using words incorrectly. They maintain that composition presupposes extensive reading in the target language and that composition, properly done, presupposes an ability to think in the language rather than translating from the base language, and they complain that while composition is easy to assign, it is difficult to correct. Thus they raise questions about its value and efficiency in providing precise, systematic feedback. They argue that composition is a highly sophisticated, advanced skill, lying outside the realm of basic training. Accordingly, they feel that composition would be best taught as a special course by a native-speaker/writer who nas been trained to teach composition to non-natives, through the use of special materials designed for just this purpose.

The real question, however, is whether learners' needs at the lower levels justify the weight assigned to composition. Aside from letter and message writing, it is doubtful that the majority of students will need to compose in the target language. We need only ask ourselves how much composition students will do in their native language after college, aside from professionrelated writing. The minority which does require this skill later would arguably benefit from a specialized course such as that described above. In any case, from the viewpoint of practical need, the time and effort spent on composition in the Language Learning Program should be carefully reevaluated. In fact, the weight assigned to each skill in this program should be carefully thought through from the prospective of students' needs.

Skill integration is the final problem concerning the role of skill in an eventual theory of language learning objectives. In the teaching of East Asian languages, achieving the proper skill-mix is particularly difficult. Due, I believe, to the influence of the Native Teaching Paradigm, clear distinctions are rarely made between the study of the oral and written media. This confusion is apparent in textual materials which use the native orthography rather than romanization to teach speech, in tests of oral skills which require reading and writing in the native orthography, even in dictation tests, designed to check control of the native orthgraphy, yet at the same time

testing comprehension. Any theory of learning objectives must certainly lay out the differences between oral and written media skills, explore the relation between speech control and the ability to read and take account of the different cognitive mechanisms involved, such as recognition as opposed to recall.

The East Asian language field is in particular need of a systematic approach to the skill problems discussed above. Especially, specialists must realize that oral and written media skills are quite different, that reading and writing are quite different skills and do not go hand in hand, that romanization is only a representation of speech, not a substitute for the native orthography used in reading and writing, and that reading is quite distinct from decoding. To continue this last point, a textbook or set of materials consisting of a text and word list is not a "Reader" but a "Decoder." As far as I can discern, there is only one true "Reader" in the entire field of East Asian languages and that is Jorden's Beginning Japanese Reader, a text consisting not of character and kanji lists, but rather of reading build-ups and texts designed to be "read" under time pressure, not laboriously decoded.

I have now discussed three issues which, I maintain, must be resolved in the strategic domain through strategic innovations: a logistical restructuring of the curriculum along the lines of a Language Learning-Language Utilization dichotomy, the establishment of meaningful expectations as to what the former program can realistically accomplish, and a definition of the objectives of basic language learning focusing on the notion of "skill."

The fourth, final, and most important issue to be raised is the agreement needed in the field of foreign language education on the qualifications of those entrusted to manage and teach in the Language Learning Program. Such a program, I propose, should have a single director with all those qualifications of a pedagogical linguist or "pedalinguist," to use Jorden's (1981) terms. That is, a person trained in linguistics and in language pedagogy. Whether this person is a native speaker of the base or target language is not critical, so long as he or she has the above qualifications and an active command of both languages. Through this pedagogical linguist the insights of the Linguistics, Psycholinguistic/Applied Linguistic and TESL Paradigms can be brought to bear in an applied form within the Language Learning Program.

At the classroom level within this program, I urge that we take the strong stand -- at least with regard to non-Indo-European languages and cultures -- that all courses be team-taught.

The native-speaking teacher is not merely invaluable but, I would argue, indispensable. Equally indispensable is a base-language native speaker who has learned the target language as a second language, has resided in the target culture, and who has had rigorous training in linguistics and in pedagogy. I am not speaking here of the old distinction between a "linguist" and a "native-speaking drillmaster." The base-language teacher explains structure, to be sure, but then goes on to teach learning strategies and communication conventions. The function of this team member is to prepare the students, using the base language, for those classes entirely within the target language. Such an approach allows both members of the team to draw on their own backgrounds and strengths, thus fully to satisfy the learner's needs. Native-speaking teachers should, of course, be trained under the guidance of the pedagogical linguist director, but they should indeed be teachers -- with all this term implies -- not simply "drillmasters." The pedagogical linguist and the team working cooperatively on program design, preparation of teaching materials, testing and evaluation, etc. would seem to form an effective system for setting realistic expectations and insuring the proper definition, weight assignment and integration of skills.

Incidentally, I am not proposing that this management structure is valid only for Americans learning foreign languages in this country. I feel sure that this method makes sense for basic foreign language study in general. Thus, for example, I would suggest that an English program in China should be directed by a pedagogical linguist working with teams consisting of a native-Chinese speaker who has been trained in linguistics and pedagogy, who has studied English as a second language, and who has lived in an English-speaking environment, working in coordination with a native English-speaking teacher. The principles of design, I maintain, should be essentially the same.

Conclusion

I feel that I have now made at least a few plausible suggestions for grappling with the conflicting paradigms mentioned earlier. Such innovations as these, rather than the tactical innovations discussed earlier, are much more likely, in my opinion, to lead to agreement on the design of textual materials intended for foreigners, on the goals and management of teacher training, on the design of tests, including standardized tests in the East Asian field -- even on the judicious application of teaching/learning methodologies. An agreement on

the objectives of foreign language study will hasten the implementation of such innovations and may even allow us to begin the long overdue task of educating the embarrassingly naive American language learner as to what foreign language study is actually all about.

Will we ever see these sorts of strategic innovations? It should be pointed out that a great many such innovations have already been implemented in several language programs with which I am familiar. There is nothing terribly unrealistic or unattainable here. But we probably will not see these types of innovations enacted en masse unless we overcome the enemy, and the enemy is us -- the members of the various paradigms within the academic community.

The fundamental problems in the teaching of foreign languages have their roots in the academy, are perpetuated by the academy, and, I suggest, can only be resolved within the academy. The curricular structure of an earlier era in higher education with respect to foreign language study, the very structure evidenced by the various paradigms, is being increasingly challenged to meet new and different sorts of demands, as well as to meet the traditional demands more efficiently. Outside funding, presidential and national committees, crisis-oriented task forces, and innovative tactical, methodological innovations are not nearly so likely to resolve these problems as is consensus on new priorities and subsequent restructuring by the members of the scholarly community themselves.

A particularly important question is whether the academy can recover from its schizophrenia regarding the value placed on basic, elementary and intermediate language instruction on the one side and the value placed on the more advanced, discipline-based language utilization curriculum on the other.

If basic language instruction is a poor cousin to "content" and "substantive" courses; if it does not deserve the attention and involvement of academic specialists but is relegated to "technicians"; if research into the complex field of foreign language acquisition and the application of results are not scholarly endeavors; if lower level language instruction is a necessary evil to be reluctantly tolerated by discipline specialists in need of enrollments in advanced courses; then such elementary instruction obviously does not belong in the academy and we should say so. We can then request that this unsavory burden be borne by the secondary schools, or, in the case of the less commonly taught languages, by private institutions, special summer programs, and the like.

If, on the contrary, such basic training is a legitimate area of academic endeavor, if such a curriculum and its content are commensurate with the goals of a college education, then, in all fairness, such language instruction and its leadership should be awarded the same status and resources that the academic community has for so long given the language utilization specialists and their curriculum.

In conclusion, I hope that my remarks today will not be misconstrued as the same old trite appeal -- that those of us involved in foreign language education, and in the teaching of East Asian languages in particular, really ought to get our house in order. To the contrary, I have tried to demonstrate that basic foreign language education, as such, actually has no house. Constructing one, establishing a coherent and unified discipline that recognizes the complexity of foreign language acquisition and the need for professional expertise, is, to my thinking, an innovation long overdue, a new priority of the first order.

NOTES

1. I wish to thank Eleanor Jorden and James Noblitt of Cornell University and Galal Walker of Ohio State University for taking the time to discuss with me many of the issues raised in this paper. Also, I would like to thank John McCoy, who, over the years, has stimulated and developed my interest in the problems inherent in the teaching of Chinese.

2. I am grateful to Galal Walker for these terms.

3. These terms are borrowed from Lambert (1981) though my definitions may be different.

For further reading see:

Jorden, Eleanor H., "Language and Area Studies: In Search of a Meaningful Relationship?", Journal of Asian Studies (November 1981).

Lambert, Richard D., "Language Learning and Language Utilization," paper presented at the 1981 Association for Asian Studies Conference, Toronto, Canada.

TESTING AND EVALUATION

John L. D. Clark

I would certainly like to express my appreciation for having been invited to speak with you this afternoon, but at the same time, I feel it is very important for us all to be very clear about the extent of my qualifications in the field of East Asian languages. My command of Japanese, for instance, consists of the receptive and to some extent productive knowledge of two important lexical items: sake and oshibori. However, I do have some background in language testing and assessment as a general process, whose rationale and basic rules of operation, I believe, remain constant for all languages. Moreover, over the past three years, I have had the opportunity to collaborate with Dr. Jorden and other Japanese scholars on the development of a proficiency test of listening comprehension and reading in Japanese. This has just been made available by Educational Testing Service following its development through a grant from the Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission. Although I did not appreciably expand my own competence in Japanese as a result of this activity, I did gain what I feel to be some degree of insight concerning the application of basic testing principles to oriental languages.

Because of the fairly short time available to us this afternoon, I would like to limit my remarks to the specific area of language proficiency testing, as opposed to achievement testing. In order, however, to adequately contrast the two types of assessment, we should review the basic characteristics of achievement testing. Achievement testing seeks to determine the student's acquisition or lack of acquisition of material that has been formally covered in a particular course or teaching program. As such, the achievement test looks closely at, and attempts to reflect to the greatest extent possible, both the content and the pedagogical approach of the teaching process itself. Say a given course required the student to learn how to write out series of sentences such as "the chopsticks of my maiden aunt are on the table." A proper and appropriate achievement test for such a course would ask the student to write out a number of sentences of this type. It should be noted that, from a theoretical viewpoint, the degree of "life value," "utility," "practicality," etc. of the material presented in the test is not at issue. Provided that the test adequately and accurately reflects curricular content, it may be considered a "good" achievement test. We should also hasten to point out that there is certainly no prohibition against having the course and the associated achievement tests correspond closely with external language-use criteria, and in a course aimed at developing genuine functional proficiency on the part of the language students, the achievement tests would indeed be expected to reflect, or at least fairly closely approximate, real-life language use.

A precisely reverse orientation applies for proficiency tests. Their basic purpose is to reflect real-life language use to the greatest extent possible within the technical testing constraints involved. In so doing, the proficiency test looks only at language-use situations from "real-life" communicative contexts outside the classroom (e.g., conversing with native speakers, listening to radio or television programs in the target language, reading authentic unedited target language texts such as newspaper articles) and attempts to determine the student's ability to perform linguistically in these settings.

The touchstone characteristic of the language proficiency test is that it looks exclusively at the "real-world" language situation and has no necessary relationship whatsoever with any particular course of instruction. To the extent that a particular course or program wishes to address itself to developing real-life capabilities on the students' part, then a usefully close relationship between the course on the one hand and the proficiency test on the other can and should exist. However, the proficiency test itself need not have any formal connection with a given course or curriculum. It is precisely the curriculum-free nature of the proficiency test that allows it to carry out its major functions as arbiter and standard-bearer for the pragmatic outcomes of foreign language instruction.

There are at least four basic uses of real-life referenced proficiency tests:

(1) To determine the qualifications of individuals to engage in various types of real-life activities that make use of the tested language. Through the development of appropriate normative information relating scores on a particular proficiency test to, for example, the ability to travel aborad at a "survival" level of listening comprehension and speaking proficiency, or to enter and not fail at a particular type of employment involving active use of the language, it becomes possible to counsel examinees regarding their prospects of "success" at making effective use of the language in genuine communicative settings and/or to assist admissions officers or employers in making accurate selection judgments for study-abroad programs, international business hiring, and so forth.

(2) On an aggregate basis, help to determine the "national yield" of individuals who have various specified, real-life referenced levels of language competence, for broad programmatic and planning purposes.

(3) To serve as criterion measures against which the effectiveness of various teaching methodologies or "delivery systems" for foreign language instruction can be determined.

(4) To provide a quality control mechanism through which institutions of higher learning or other language teaching programs can determine the extent to which their instructional activities are indeed helping students develop a useful level of language proficiency. Harry Truman used to say "the buck stops here" in various presidential contexts: in the foreign language teaching context, the buck stops with actual student performance on a properly prepared, validated, and extensively normed proficiency test. In this regard, the proficiency test plays no favorites with respect to the individuals tested or the institutions at which they were trained; rather, the results speak for themselves.

Developing Proficiency Tests

If these and other purposes which properly developed language proficiency tests can serve are indeed important and worth addressing, the next question becomes that of properly developing the assessment instruments involved. It must be noted that developing a language proficiency test that actually does what it is intended to do, without at some point in the process invalidating or seriously compromising the meaning and interpretation of the test results, is very difficult. Neither native speakers of the language nor instructors may be presumed de facto to have the requisite skills and perceptions in this area. In fact, many well-intentioned test development activities undertaken in and by the field may be found, on close inspection, to be seriously flawed.

One question that must be asked is: Does the test content accurately reflect real-life speaking and writing situations? A proficiency test of listening comprehension, for example, should use spoken passages which actually are excerpts from, or close facsimilies of, conversations that would take place in real life, or radio announcments that one would hear on the morning news broadcast, and so forth. Ideally, although this is rarely done in practice, the passages should consist of recordings of real utterances, capturing the hesitations, false starts, mechanical distortion, and other imperfections of these speech events as they actually occur. Passages specially contrived for the test should be avoided. By the same token, reading comprehension passages should come directly from representative printed texts, rather than be prepared from whole cloth (and, in all probability, artifically) especially for the test.

Beyond the authenticity question is the very complex matter of stimulus-response interaction. Briefly, all testing may be viewed as the presentation of a particular stimulus on the part of the tester (or his surrogate, the test booklet or test tape) and the production of a particular response by the examinee. Sometimes, the nature of the stimulus is fixed. For example, listening comprehension testing requires the stimulus of a spoken passage but permits the type of response to vary. On other occasions (for example, in testing writing proficiency), the response is fixed, but the stimulus may vary. Unless the stimulus/response combinations adopted for a particular testing purpose are carefully thought out, the testing intent may well be confounded. For example, intent may well be confounded. For example, a test requiring students to answer printed multiple-choice questions in Chinese based on a spoken passage may not accurately reveal listening comprehension ability. For conceivably, the student could adequately understand the spoken passages but lack the ability to read the printed characters provided as response options. This, of course, would invalidate the procedure as a measure of listening comprehension per se. Requiring a student to write out (in Chinese) answers to questions on a reading comprehension passage would also improperly "mix" language skills. The preceding are very simple concepts in theory, but recalcitrant and difficult to implement in practice.

Many other problems and pitfalls await the enthusiastic but relatively unsophisticated test developer, especially in the preparation of multiple-choice questions. Without naming the organization involved in its development, I was asked to review a test in which one of the sections consisted of spoken passages in Japanese, followed by three printed English options. One set of options read as follows:

(A) The color is bad.

(B) The well is bad.

(C) The thread is bad.

Here, the extremely far-fetched nature of options B and C would permit the perceptive student to choose A as the correct answer, even if he only dimly understood the passages. Or another set:

(A) I'm looking for the key.

(B) I'm looking for the crab.

(C) I'm looking for the seashell.

The purpose of these examples and discussion of potential problem areas is not to give a crash course in test development but to indicate some of the many ways in which the test development process may go awry if it is not addressed in a detailed, systematic, and informed way.

Developing East Asian Language Proficiency Tests

How, then, could one best develop a proficiency-oriented test of Chinese, Korean, or other East Asian language? First, general testing principles and experience gained in the course of the Japanese proficiency test project indicate that the group charged with preparing the actual test should include: native speakers of the language in question; qualified (if non-native) American participants who have a good working knowledge of the language; and testing specialists. Native speakers would be needed to insure that the passages and associated test questions were completely idiomatic and natural. The other contributors would have the complementary assignment of ensuring that important technical considerations involved in overall test design, selection of stimulus materials, and preparation of test questions were fully incorporated in the test development process.

Once the developed tests were available for large-scale administration, it would be crucially important to carry out a series of use-validation studies, designed to develop and report empirically determined correspondences between various score levels on the test and related real-life outcomes (for example, the probability of "holding one's own" in social conversation with a native speaker of the language or adequately performing the language-related aspects of a particular type of employment). The normative information required to make such determinations can be obtained in any of several ways, including self-reports on the part of the examinees concerning their degree of success "in the field" subsequent to testing and "second-party" appraisals (for example, judgments of supervisors as to on-the-job language skills of recently-hired employees). From the viewpoint of socially valuable assessment activities, the job has only begun when the test is available for administration; instead of resting on their laurels, the test developers must carry out follow-up analyses to obtain the kinds of use-related information that give practical experiential meaning to the test scores.

The tasks to be accomplished in the East Asian language testing area are indeed challenging, since to my knowledge no

standardized, across-programs-applicable tests of general language proficiency exist in these languages other than the Japanese Proficiency Test. The JPT itself is limited to listening comprehension and reading, and tests or testing frameworks for the assessment of active speaking proficiency have yet to be developed. In this regard, the Foreign Service Institute (FSI) interview procedure deserves consideration as a possible model. Because the basic principles of operation of FSI-type interviews and the scoring scales along which the examinees' performance is evaluated are shared by all languages, it seems wise to consider inter-language cooperation and coordination in developing testing procedures and an appropriate administrative mechanism to carry out this type of testing in the East Asian languages on a widescale basis.

In closing, it might be useful to consider the essential consequence of not developing and making use of the kind of language proficiency tests we have been discussing this afternoon. This is quite purely and simply that without such tests there is no way to assess the pragmatic outcomes of the instructional process or, by the same token, to know whether commendations or, in the common educational parlance, recommendations are due the t aching program. If there is no interest in having this type of information available, that is one matter; if there is such interest, the use of carefully thought out, properly and professionally developed, and extensively validated tests of functional language proficiency is crucial to the task.